FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-184
Monday
25 September 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-184 | 25 September 1989

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Global Scale of NATO Military Exercises Viewed ... 1
'Paces-89' Demonstrates 'Military Might' *[PRAVDA 22 Sep]* ... 1
Exercises Generate 'Concern' *[Portrait Filatov on Moscow Radio]* ... 1
NATO Troop Movement Proposal Criticized *[Zhukov on Moscow Radio]* ... 2
NATO Action on Chemical Weapons Ban Urged *[East Berlin DER MORGEN 19 Sep]* ... 3
Military Specialists Inspect Activities in France *[Moscow Radio]* ... 3

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Bloc Ideology Secretaries Confer in Berlin *[PRAVDA 22 Sep]* ... 5
Medvedev Cited on Conference *[PRAVDA 22 Sep]* ... 5
Further From Medvedev *[Moscow TV]* ... 6
Yakovlev Leaves for Bloc Conference in Varna *[TASS]* ... 6
Shishlin Says Moscow 'Understands' Hungary *[AFP]* ... 6

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Foreign Ministry Spokesman Cited on Various Issues ... 8
Asserts Stance on Hungarian Decision *[TASS]* ... 8
Analyzes De Klerk's Inaugural Speech *[TASS]* ... 8
Approves Work of Arab 3-Man Committee *[TASS]* ... 8
'Roundtable' Notes Arms Talks, Cambodia Conflict *[Andrianov on Moscow Radio]* ... 8
United Nations Political Debate Begins 25 Sep *[TASS]* ... 13
Petrovskiy Urges Wider United Nations Role *[TASS]* ... 13
Joint Working Group on West European Ties Meets *[TASS]* ... 14
Ozawa Attends International Meeting in Tokyo *[TASS]* ... 14

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bush Says Summit Agreement 'Great News' *[IZVESTIYA 25 Sep]* ... 15
Scowcroft Praises U.S.-Soviet Talks *[TASS]* ... 15
Baker Comments on Bush's Meeting With Gorbachev *[IZVESTIYA 23 Sep]* ... 15
Bush Sees Favorable Prospects for Soviet-U.S. Ties *[TASS]* ... 15
Shevardnadze 'Candid' on Ethnic Problems *[London DAILY TELEGRAPH 11 Sep]* ... 16
Shevardnadze-Baker Talks Begin in Wyoming ... 16
TASS Rounds Up 1st Day *[TASS]* ... 16
'Businesslike' Talks Proceeding *[TASS]* ... 16
Two Agreements Expected *[Moscow TV]* ... 17
Pre-Talks Atmosphere Viewed *[PRAVDA 23 Sep]* ... 17
Shevardnadze, Baker Open Talks *[TASS]* ... 18
USSR-U.S. Form Working Groups *[Moscow TV]* ... 18
PRAVDA on First Day of Talks *[24 Sep]* ... 18
IZVESTIYA Reports Progress of Talks *[24 Sep]* ... 19
TASS on 'Constructive' Talks ... 20
Moscow Radio Describes Talks ... 21
Further on Shevardnadze Talks in U.S. *[Moscow TV]* ... 22
START-Space Parts Linkage Dropped *[Tokyo KYODO]* ... 23
Shevardnadze Holds News Conference in Wyoming *[PRAVDA 25 Sep]* ... 24
TASS on Baker's Assessment of Wyoming Talks ... 28
Text of Baker's Statement on Talks *[TASS]* ... 28

Shevardnadze-Baker Joint Statement [PRAVDA 23 Sep] 29
Soviet-U.S. Statement on Chemical Weapons [PRAVDA 23 Sep] 32
Soviet-U.S. Statement on Lebanon [PRAVDA 23 Sep] 33
Political Analyst Assesses Wyoming Talks [Komsomolskaya Pravda] 34
Commentary on Shevardnadze-Baker Talks [Moscow International] 34
Shevardnadze Arrives in New York for UN Session [TASS] 35
Senator Urges Bush To Lift Trade Barriers [TASS] 35

Northeast Asia

Foreign Ministry Statement on Japanese Relations [TASS] 35

West Europe

U.K. Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher Visits 36
Thatcher Welcomed by Primakov [Moscow TV] 36
Talks With Gorbachev Begin [London PRESS ASSOCIATION] 36
Thatcher-Gorbachev Talks End [TASS] 36
Arms Control, Reform Covered [London PRESS ASSOCIATION] 37
Gorbachev Notes Role of Perestroyka [TASS] 37
Details on Talks Given [Moscow Radio] 38
More on Content of Talks [PRAVDA 24 Sep] 39
Gorbachevs Host Working Lunch [TASS] 40
Primakov Sees Off Thatcher [Moscow TV] 40
Thatcher Holds News Conference After Talks 40
TASS Report News Conference 40
Thatcher on Disarmament Prospects [TASS] 40
Thatcher Opposes Entry in IMF, GATT [TASS] 40
Thatcher 'Greatly Encouraged' [London PRESS ASSOCIATION] 41
Thatcher Says Perestroyka 'Visionary' [TASS] 42
Thatcher Supports Perestroyka [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Sep] 42
PRAVDA on Praise of Perestroyka [24 Sep] 43
Thatcher Interviewed After Moscow News Conference [Moscow International] 43
Gorbachev, France's PCF Leader Marchais Meet [PRAVDA 23 Sep] 44
Leaders Discuss Perestroyka [TASS] 46
Gorbachev, Marchais Praise Party Ties [Moscow Radio] 47

Latin America & Caribbean

Shevardnadze To Visit Nicaragua in Early October [PRAVDA 23 Sep] 47

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Second Session of Supreme Soviet 'Crucial' [TASS] 48
Supreme Soviet Begins Second Session 25 Sep [TASS] 48
Gorbachev Delivers Supreme Soviet Opening Speech [Moscow Radio] 48
Lukyanov Notes Supreme Soviet Procedures [Moscow Radio] 50
TASS Reports Agenda for Supreme Soviet 51
Speakers Address Supreme Soviet Session [Moscow Radio] 51

Political & Social

Gorbachev Meets Central Committee Workers 21 Sep 52
Speech to Workers Published [PRAVDA 23 Sep] 52
Further on Meeting [TASS] 54
Gorbachev Discusses Party in Society [TASS] 56
PRAVDA Details 20 Sep CPSU Plenum Debate [22 Sep] 56
Further on CPSU Plenum Speeches 20 Sep [TASS] 82
Medvedev Reports to CPSU Plenum 20 Sep [Moscow Radio] 86

Kovtunenko Addresses CPSU Plenum [20 Sep] [Moscow Radio] 97
CPSU Plenum Adopts Draft Nationalities Policy [PRAVDA 24 Sep] 98
Nationalities Draft Plan Criticized [SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 19 Sep] 107
Pugo on Party Control Committee Cases Represents [Moscow TV] 108
Yeltsin 'Indignant' Over PRAVDA Article [Moscow TV] 109
Manayev Acted 'On Own' [Budapest Radio] 109
LA REPUBBLICA Correspondent Apologizes [Moscow International] 109
Yeltsin Comments on Visit to United States [Moscow TV] 109
Yeltsin Buys Disposable Syringes for Hospitals [Moscow TV] 110
Yeltsin Views Politburo Changes, Reform Pace [Moscow International] 110
USSR Supreme Soviet Session Previewed [TASS] 111
Nishanov Describes 2-Month Session [TASS] 111
Moscow TV To Cover Event [IZVESTIYA 21 Sep] 112
Street Fight Reported in Semipalatinsk, Two Dead [Moscow Radio] 112
Kazakh Supreme Soviet Adopts Language Law [TASS] 112
'Serious Situation' Described in Nagorno-Karabakh [Moscow Radio] 113
Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Resumes Session [Moscow TV] 113
Declares 'Sovereignty' [Hamburg DPA] 114
Armenian Supreme Soviet Session Resumes [TASS] 114
Organization of Blockade Should Be 'Condemned' [Yerevan International] 115
Blockade Causes Tension [PRAVDA 22 Sep] 115
Armenian Officials Interviewed [Moscow TV] 116
Arutyunyan Discusses Region's Situation [Moscow TV] 116
Paper Shortage in Armenia Hits Printing Plants [ARMENPRESS] 117
Lithuania Rules Polish Rayons' Status Invalid
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 24 Sep] 117
Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Discusses 1939 Pact [Vilnius International] 117
Incorporation Declared 'Illegal' [Helsinki International] 118
Lithuanian Party Program Foundations Published [Moscow Radio] 118
Bases Is 'Federalization' [TASS] 119
Party Secretary Baltrunas Assesses Plenum Results [Moscow TV] 119
Foreign Debt Statistics Published [TASS] 120
Media Leaders Describe Press Role in Perestroyka [TASS] 120

Economic:

'Cosmos-2043' Launched 22 Sep, Parameters Given [TASS] 121

Combat Scale of NATO Military Exercises Viewed

'Pacex-89' Demonstrates 'Military Might'

PM2709124789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 89 Second Edition p 7

[Unattributed report: "At the USSR Defense Ministry"]

[Text] Once more the Asia-Pacific region is unsettled. The "Pacex-89" exercise involving U.S. and allied armed forces has been taking place since 16 September. In terms of its geographical scope, the composition of the forces and resources involved, and the content of the tasks rehearsed, the exercise is the biggest operational measure conducted by the United States in the region since World War II.

The headquarters staffs, large units and units of the armed forces of Japan, South Korea, Canada, the Philippines, and a number of other countries are involved. Altogether more than 200,000 men, over 300 aircraft and around 100 warships and vessels, including 4 aircraft carriers and a battleship carrying Tomahawk cruise missiles, are taking part. The exercise, which is under the direction of Admiral Huntington Hardisty, commander of U.S. Armed Forces in the Pacific and Indian Ocean, will last until 10 November.

A characteristic feature of "Pacex-89" is the fact that its timetable and program have been coordinated with "Autumn Forge-89," a series of major NATO allied forces exercises in Europe and the Atlantic.

This fact graphically illustrates the integrated thrust of the operational training measures for the troops and naval forces of the United States and its allies currently being carried out in various regions of the world.

It is noteworthy that such a demonstration of military might is taking place precisely at a time when, thanks to Soviet peace initiatives, specific ways of reducing military confrontation in both Europe and the Asia-Pacific region have taken shape.

Exercises Generate Concern

LD2709181789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 27 Sep 89

[From the "International Situation—Questions and Answers" program presented by All-Union radio commentator Konstantin Patsyuk with Major General Viktor Ivanovich Filatov, editor in chief of VOYENNO-ISTORICHESKIY ZHURNAL, commentator Yevgeniy Ulepovskiy, commentator Andrey Plashenkov and Sergey Pravdin, colleague]

[Excerpt] [Patsyuk] Hello, respected comrades. We begin the broadcast, which is based on radio listeners' letters. At the present time, the West, judging from reports being received from various countries, is for the first time in history conducting military exercises on a global scale. Yes, I have not made a mistake: precisely on a global scale. It seems that the troops of countries from all continents have been put into action. This is occurring at a time when a universal warming is being felt throughout the world. The USSR has started a reduction of its forces on a unilateral basis, the withdrawal of our regiments from Poland, Hungary, and other socialist states is continuing. Here are exercises on a global scale. Even our wide contacts in connection with such a turn of events has been officially declared, all the more so as these war games in Western Europe are taking place close to our borders and it is difficult to determine whether these are exercises or the combat deployment of invasion forces. NATO occupies a special place in these exercises. Major General Viktor Ivanovich Filatov, editor in chief of the VOYENNO-ISTORICHESKIY ZHURNAL [MILITARY HISTORICAL MAGAZINE], is with us in the studio today.

[Filatov] You have spoken correctly about the exercises on a global scale and NATO's role. Such exercises have started; they are underway. NATO, as everybody unites, as is known, 16 of the very major and highly developed capitalist countries. Japan alone is not a member of NATO. The territories of the countries of the participants comprises more than 22 million sq km; their population includes more than 670 million people. This year the NATO bloc widely marked its 40th anniversary. This event gave cause for definite appraisals and summaries of the results of NATO's activities. This has been done before and is also being done. We and the West, however, have concentrated attention on NATO's military activities.

[Patsyuk] So, is this not correct?

[Filatov] These days, as it seems to me, relating to NATO in this way means not understanding what NATO is, in its 1989 mode.

[Patsyuk] What do you mean, Viktor Ivanovich?

[Filatov] I think NATO's military activities can today be compared with the invisible part of an iceberg.

[Patsyuk] What is the invisible part?

[Filatov] As is well known, the invisible part of an iceberg exceeds the visible by many times. It is NATO's so-called nonmilitary activity.

[Patsyuk] This is really something new. Can you not give more details about this invisible part?

[Filatov] Certainly, Konstantin Nikolayevich! If you want the complete details, see the 12th issue of our VOYENNO-ISTORICHESKIY ZHURNAL. An article will be published on research into the problem in question by Ilaev, a research officer of one of the institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences. NATO's nonmilitary activity today encompasses firstly economics and secondly the scientific and technical and the ecological spheres and politics. From the point of view of the

administration structure: the NATO Council, the other national secretariat, specialized committees, subcommittees and various working groups relate to the nonmilitary part. This system of administration is composed of five main subsystems. Political, military, military-economic, scientific and technical, and the sphere of so-called civilian defense. It must be noted that the division into military and nonmilitary spheres of administration does not only have a theoretical but also a practical significance and testifies to the presence of flexibility in NATO's organizational structure. It, for example, allows that same France, which has formally left the military, to actively continue participating in the political organization of the bloc.

[Patrushev] Evidently, economics does not play the last role here. How does the cooperation of NATO countries in the economic sphere take place?

[Filatov] That is right. Everything starts with economics here, too. The safeguarding of the bloc's military preparations is most closely connected with the state of the economies of the NATO member countries. There is one problem here. The economic conflicts which occur from time to time between the bloc's member countries. For this consultations on economic issues exist. They are called upon to aid the settlement of these problems. Common economic positions in relation to the USSR and the Warsaw Treaty countries are also drawn up. With this aim colloquiums take place in NATO headquarters every year. Thus, for example, in April 1987 one was dedicated to the problems of the economic development of the USSR, where such issues as the content and the main trends of the 12th 5-year plan, public health in the USSR, and the problems of labor resources were discussed.

[Patrushev] How is our perestroyka and the processes which are now occurring in our country being reflected in the activities of these nonmilitary NATO bodies?

[Filatov] It is being reflected, and very seriously. In March 1988 the issue of the influence of perestroyka in the USSR on the economic processes occurring in other socialist countries was discussed. On the eve of the jubilee session of the NATO Council the Directorate on Economic Issues prepared a colloquium on economic reforms in the USSR and their implementation. According to the procedure existing in NATO, measures being advanced at headquarters are closed for journalists from countries which are not bloc members. The colloquium in question was no exception.

[Patrushev] What is the main point of the coordination of the foreign policy activities of the NATO countries?

[Filatov] This, as they say, is the crux of the matter. At the basis of the economic policy of the NATO bloc is the concept of economic exhaustion of the USSR by means of foisting on it expensive military programs and by other methods, including embargoes and limiting the supply of various wares, which are declared strategic, to the USSR and other Warsaw Treaty countries. Of course, such nonmilitary activity has not been spoken about before in our country, to say the least. The article by the USSR Academy of Sciences research officer to be published in our VOYENNO-ISTORICHESKIY ZHURNAL number 12 is the first work in this direction.

[Patrushev] All the same, today, as right these global exercises, the military activities of NATO are, as before, very significant and are even increasing. What is this about?

[Filatov] I recently spoke to a historian who is well-known in our country. He is concerned with the problem of the correlation of the forces of democracy and the forces of totalitarianism and militarism on a world scale. We speak about our perestroyka and its opponents. This historian suddenly said: In the West there are forces for which our perestroyka is desirable and mortally dangerous. I honestly confess that every day I expect great provocation against our country by these forces.

I also think that perhaps these global games on our borders are such a provocation, an attack on our perestroyka, so that we cease our reduction of the Armed Navy and cut short all movement in the direction of democracy, glasnost, and openness so that we started to dig the trenches of the Cold War, and not only of Cold War.

[Patrushev] Thank you, Viktor Ivanovich. [passage omitted]

NATO Troop Movement Proposal Criticized

LD270[illegible] Moscow International Service in Russian 1500 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Aleksandr Zholkver commentary]

[Text] As we have already reported, the countries of NATO have put forward their proposals on specific military measures to strengthen trust in Europe at the Vienna talks on conventional arms and armed forces. I have asked Aleksandr Zholkver, our political observer, to comment on these proposals.

[Zholkver] The representative of the FRG, setting out the NATO program in Vienna, called it the most comprehensive one, the most detailed one, and the one that promises the most. However on acquainting oneself with this document, one gets the impression that all these superlatives relate at best to its dimensions—there are 14 pages of it. What is it all about? Mainly about measures on notification in good time in the event of major military exercises being held and reservists being called up. Well, it goes without saying that in themselves such notifications are useful so as not to arouse unnecessary concern when large numbers of troops are being moved. But, nevertheless, it would perhaps be better to carry out less of these troop movements altogether. With regard to this, NATO proposes limiting the scale of military exercises to 40,000 servicemen and to 800 tanks.

But the whole trouble is that the NATO command itself in no way adheres to such a recommendation. It just so happens that today on the territory which stretches from northern Norway to the eastern frontiers of Turkey, NATO maneuvers are being conducted in which more than 200,000 servicemen, 3,000 tanks, and about 2,000 fighter aircraft are taking part. In addition, in the adjacent waters of the Atlantic, naval exercises of NATO are taking place, in which almost 200 ships and 500 more aircraft are involved. I will add that at the same time exercises have begun in the Asian-Pacific region with the participation of 200,000 servicemen, 100 ships, and 500 aircraft of the United States, Japan, South Korea, and a number of other countries. Here superlatives are really applicable: the largest exercises since the time of World War II and the most extensive in the territory they cover. And indeed all this is happening at the same time as positive changes in the relations between the east and the west are evident, as the heads of the leading countries of NATO and of the Warsaw Pact are meeting, as talks are being carried on at various levels on reducing arms and as the Soviet Union and other countries of the Warsaw Pact are unilaterally even reducing their armed forces.

However, the leadership of NATO has its own, and I must say totally strange logic on this account. In the VOA program, for example, one is able to listen to the reasoning that in the opinion of NATO the reduction of numbers in the Soviet Army only raises its fighting efficiency, like, they said, the football player who having got rid of unnecessary weight, starts to run more quickly across the field. But, after all, if the NATO command really holds to this point of view, then why should it in turn not resort to such a tactic. Reduce its armed forces, as we are doing, to start with, if only by half a million. Then perhaps there would not be the need to hold such major maneuvers even with notification in good time. This would really be the most superlative superlative, as it were.

NATO Actions on Chemical Weapons Ban Urged

AU2709134089 East Berlin DER MORGEN in German 29 Sep 89 p 7

[Article by Vladimir Nekanorov from NOVOSTI: "Life Without the 'Silent Death'"]

[Text] The Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states have a firm and clear standpoint on chemical weapons. The Soviet Union is still the only country which has declared the amount of its stockpiles of such weapons—about 50,000 tonnes, calculated in the amount of chemical agent. The Soviet Union has never used chemical weapons and, in line with its basic attitude toward these means of destruction, has never passed such weapons to any other state or deployed them outside its own territory. The other Warsaw Pact states have expressly stated that they do not have chemical weapons.

Against this background, the existence of large arsenals of U.S. chemical weapons in the FRG seems extremely ominous, all the more so since the NATO states have so far not given an unambiguous assurance that their armed forces will not use these weapons.

At the same time, one has to recall that the Soviet Union has stopped the production of chemical weapons and will start destroying its stockpiles this year. The Soviet Union advocates strictest international monitoring, including on-site inspections without the right to refuse permission for these inspections, and it is willing to do everything possible so that a convention on the ban of chemical weapons will be signed by the end of the year.

And what about the other side? During his election campaign U.S. President George Bush announced that he wants to be remembered as the man who achieved the general and complete ban of chemical weapons. Well, this is certainly a praiseworthy goal, and the U.S. Administration has already taken certain steps in this direction, which has facilitated progress at the negotiations. It would be only logical if these first successes were expanded, the potential of trust were strengthened, and the declarations of intent were underpinned with serious matters.

However, so far the fact is that in this field deeds do not quite correspond to words, to put it mildly. The chemical factory in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, for instance, where components for binary weapons are produced, is operating at full swing. According to THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER, hundreds of thousands of nerve-gas grenades are stockpiled in the United States. In the view of experts, 1.7 million grenades are to be produced. The Pentagon has ordered the development of chemical warheads for tactical and cruise missiles. The testing of a new missile system with chemical multiple warheads is planned.

The Washington Defense Department wants to supplement its arsenals with new, strong poisons, which are capable of penetrating gas masks and other protective means. According to THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, the development of these substances might start a new round in the chemical arms race and hinders the successful course of the negotiations for a complete chemical-weapons ban. "We are completely unable to decide whether we want to have the world control chemical weapons or proliferate them," the newspaper quotes a congressman's aide as saying.

However, the world is waiting for a decision, and it is waiting for the only correct one, the final and irrevocable decision of all states. Further delays will have a detrimental effect.

Military Specialists Interpret Activities on Prague

LD2709144789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] In accordance with the clauses of the Stockholm document on confidence-and-security-building measures

and disarmament in Europe, the USSR government asked the French government for permission to make an inspection of military activity being carried out on its territory.

After receiving a positive reply to the request, a group of Soviet military specialists arrived in France today and started the inspection.

Bloc Ideology Secretaries Confer in Berlin

PM270ct891605BV Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Sep 89 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Secretaries' Conference"]

[Text] Berlin, 21 Sep—A conference of central committee ideology secretaries from the socialist countries' fraternal parties opened here today.

The CPSU delegation was headed by V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The conference provides an extensive exchange of opinions and experience on topical questions of ideological work in the fraternal parties in building socialism and strengthening their cooperation in the struggle for peace and disarmament.

Opening the session, K. Hager, member of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the SED Central Committee, noted that processes of profound change are currently developing in the international arena and the socialist countries. They place not only higher but, above all, qualitatively new demands on the content and forms of the fraternal parties' ideological work. At a time when influential monopoly capital circles are contemning to bow to the policy of the arms race and force, when they are trying to push the questions and tasks of the struggle for peace out of the view of the world public, and to distract the public from the socialist peace offensive, the speaker said, it is necessary to step up joint efforts in the ideological sphere.

Expressing satisfaction that on the eve of the GDR's 40th anniversary Berlin is the venue for the conference, K. Hager stated: "The existence and development in central Europe of an antifascist, peaceful socialist German state is an important factor for security and stability on the continent. The past few months have seen a noticeable increase in political and ideological attacks on the socialist community states, particularly the GDR. These attacks are being made in various forms—from proposals to carry out bourgeois-style reforms to distortions and slander of socialism, ideological sabotage, direct interference in internal affairs, and violations of the socialist states' sovereignty. All this is aimed at discrediting socialism as a whole and removing it from the peoples' awareness as the only real alternative to capitalism and the problems of Third World development. In this tense situation we intend to strengthen our solidarity and cooperation and to discuss ways of opposing the activities of the enemies of socialism."

Representatives of the fraternal parties spoke during the ensuing discussion.

The conference continues Friday.

Medvedev Cited on Conference

LD270930Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Sep 89 Second Edition p 7

[Text] Berlin, 22 Sep (TASS)—A routine conference of secretaries of the Central Committees of the fraternal parties of the socialist countries on ideological issues ended its work here today. Taking part in it were representatives of the Bulgarian Communist Party, the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party, the Communist Party of Vietnam, the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED], the Workers Party of Korea, the Communist Party of Cuba, the Lao People's Revolutionary Party, the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, the Polish United Workers Party, the Romanian Communist Party, the CPSU, and the Czechoslovak Communist Party.

The conference participants exchanged opinions and experience on topical questions of the fraternal parties' ideological work in the building of socialism and strengthening their cooperation in the struggle for peace and disarmament. A press release was approved on the results of the work.

The conference participants were received at the SED Central Committee. Taking part in the meeting were G. Mittag, H. Axen, K. Hager, J. Hermann, and G. Schabowski, members of the Politburo and secretaries of the SED Central Committee.

Speaking of the results of the conference, V.A. Medvedev, member of the Politburo, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, noted in an interview with a TASS correspondent that it was useful. A very necessary discussion took place at a crucial moment when serious processes of transformation, restructuring, and improving the forms of socialist society are taking place in the socialist countries with a differing degree of intensity. Each party is responsible for its own fate and for the situation in the country. Problems are being tackled in different ways and the acuteness of these problems is not the same. So it is all the more important to have an exchange of opinions and information and a comradely discussion of questions that have arisen concerning both the general processes of the development of socialist countries and some specific problems including problems arising in our mutual relations. As a result of the conference we received a wide palette of views reflecting real processes, assessments, conclusions, and thoughts about ways of solving problems that have arisen. This considerably enriches all of us.

Perhaps the most important thing, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee stressed, is that all the delegations expressed themselves in the spirit that problems can be solved only on the basis of revealing more fully the potential of socialism, on the basis of the choice that has been made. It is necessary to develop and deepen the basis of socialist society, to defend them where this is required and to move forward. It is necessary to overcome the difficulties that have arisen before us, to raise our countries to new heights of socioeconomic and

historical development, to give our cooperation new and more modern features, based on our ideological and political closeness and at the same time proceeding from the recognition of differing approaches to solving problems.

As V.A. Medvedev went on to note, all the participants in the conference displayed great interest in Soviet perestroyka, in the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee which took place a few days ago, in the solving of problems of nationalities policy, in the convening of the next, 28th, party congress. I would like to note, he said, the constructive role that has been played by our hosts, the comrades from the leadership of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] who created very good working conditions and who made a weighty contribution to the contents and tone of the conference. The GDR is on the threshold of a major political event, the 40th anniversary of its formation. I think that this event will demonstrate the increased prestige of the GDR on the international arena, its successes in socialist construction. The participants in the conference wished our friends from the SED new successes.

Further From Medvedev

LD2709222189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Report from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The conference of ideology secretaries of the central committees of the fraternal parties ended in Berlin today.

[V. Monitovich] The participants in the conference exchanged views and experience regarding current issues in the ideological work of the fraternal parties and in intensifying cooperation in the fight for peace and disarmament. In the Central Committee building of the German Socialist Unity Party [SED] today a meeting took place between the heads of delegations and SED Central Committee Politburo members and secretaries Mittag, Axhen, Hager, Herrmann, and Schabowski. A press release was issued on the results of the conference. To end with, we asked Comrade Medvedev, head of the Soviet delegation, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to give an interview for "Vremya."

[Begin Medvedev recording] Well, one could say that a very necessary and very substantive discussion has been held. In the first place, it is a tradition for the secretaries of the Central Committees of the fraternal parties to meet periodically to discuss current problems in ideological work. Second, I would say the significance of this conference lies in the crucial moment through which the development of the socialist world, the socialist countries, is passing. Each country and each party has its own specific experience. Of course, each of the parties is not only responsible for its activities and for the situation in the country, but as a result a kind of broad spectrum is created which reflects real processes and demonstrates assessments, conclusions, and thoughts about means of solving the problems that arise. This considerably enriches all of us. Most important of all, perhaps, is that all the delegations expressed themselves in the spirit that the problems can only be solved on the basis of a fuller unfolding of socialism, of our society's potential, on the basis of the choice that has been made.

I would like to take this opportunity—and this reflects it is the common feeling among the conference participants—to say that the German Democratic Republic is approaching a major political event, the 40th anniversary of its creation. One can sense that people are preparing for this event. I think it will demonstrate the GDR's increased authority on the international arena and the successes in socialist construction in this first socialist state on German soil. [video shows conference in session, interview with Medvedev] [end recording]

Yakovlev Leaves for Bloc Conference in Varna

LD2709103589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1040 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 27 Sep (TASS)—Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, left Moscow for Varna today for a conference of secretaries of Central Committees of fraternal parties of socialist countries on international issues.

Shishlin Says Moscow 'Understands' Hungary

LD2709134589 Paris AFP in English 1321 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Excerpt] Paris, Sept 27 (AFP)—Moscow understands Hungary's decision to open its borders to let East German refugees head west and accepts the possibility of a "neutral" Hungary, according to a senior Soviet party official who said more "surprises" were in store.

Valentin Shishlin, a member of the Soviet Communist Party central committee who is in charge of Eastern bloc issues, also suggested that the "borders between states will soon disappear" and said Moscow's present view opposed any use of Soviet troops against allied countries.

He made the statements in an interview in the Paris-based leftist daily, LIBERATION. Friday:

"We understand for lots of reasons. Hungary could not force all the refugees back to East Germany," he said, stating that political and economic dissatisfaction were their main motivations for leaving.

But he remained optimistic: "I think the transformations that took place for us, as in other countries, will be useful. The borders between states will soon disappear," he said.

Reports from Budapest, meanwhile, said 518 more East German refugees crossed from Hungary into Austria overnight pushing past 18,000 the total who have fled

since Hungary opened the border on September 11. They gave the total registered crossings as 16,492.

Mr Shishlin also said "major transformations" were underway in socialist countries and could lead to "unexpected results."

"And I think we are not done with the surprises yet," he said.

He said each country must follow its own path, "and in this sense, the example of Poland is not transferable."

When asked if Poland was still a socialist state, he replied: "You know, we even ask ourselves if we are a socialist state."

He affirmed that the Soviet Union wanted to help the reform movement to take hold in the eastern bloc in "the best way."

"We are slowly emerging from the world that followed the war" and, he insisted that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Warsaw Pact were not "eternal realities."

"We are witnessing the construction of a freer world," he said, and when questioned, did not rule out a neutral Hungary, saying it was "not against the laws of physics."

Mr Shishlin viewed each eastern bloc country as a "social laboratory" of changes and transformations, including Romania, "even if I think that it is a negative experiment."

He concluded that the Soviet Union's main principle was "non-interference," stressing that "our current position is that we oppose the use of our troops in the internal affairs of socialist countries." [Passage omitted]

Foreign Ministry Spokesman Cited on Various Issues

Asserts Stance on Hungarian Decision

LD2709111089 Moscow, in ENGLISH for broadcast overseas, 1500 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 27 Sep, (TASS)—Soviet diplomatic circles regard as out of keeping with reality the commentaries that have appeared over the past few days in some U.S. newspapers, in particular THE WASHINGTON POST, claiming that Budapest informed the Soviet Union in advance of its intention to open its border to allow GDR citizens to leave for the FRG, and that "this brought no objections at all from Moscow."

These claims may mislead the world public, TASS was told today, by a spokesman from the USSR Foreign Ministry. "During our contacts we made our attitude toward the problem known to the Hungarian side. The official Soviet position, he said, was set out in the TASS statement of 12 September giving a principled assessment of the unlawful actions of the FRG, which are "incompatible with the development of the pan-European process and constitute an effort interference in the domestic affairs of a sovereign state—the German Democratic Republic."

Analyzes De Klerk's Inaugural Speech

LD2709154089 Moscow TASS in English 1444 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 27 TASS—It is considered in the Soviet Union that new South African President Frederik de Klerk has only one way to prove the sincerity of his intentions—by taking immediate action to dismantle apartheid. This meets the desire of the South African population and the aspirations of the world community, TASS was informed by a Foreign Ministry spokesman.

Soviet diplomatic quarters noted, in their comment on De Klerk's maiden speech in which he reiterated his and the ruling National Party's pre-election intent to abolish apartheid and build a democratic South Africa without discrimination by skin colour, that De Klerk's promises had once again failed to impress the overwhelming population majority which is deprived of political rights.

Anything else could hardly be expected in conditions when the state of emergency has already lasted for three years, political prisoners are kept behind bars, the ban on the activity of democratic organisations is not lifted and troops are deployed in black ghettos, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

Approves Work of Arab 3-Man Committee

LD2709230089 Moscow TASS in English 1840 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 27 TASS—The Soviet Union intends in future to render vigorous support to the Committee of Three on Lebanon and fully create a favourable atmosphere for the promotion of its effective efforts, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told TASS.

He was answering a statement by the chairman of the U.N. Security Council. The statement, approved by the council on September 20, welcomed the resumed activity of the Committee of Three and pledged full support for the actions aimed at restoring the Lebanese settlement plan.

The Soviet spokesman pointed out that the U.N. Security Council's document, adopted with the active participation of the Soviet Union, was yet another unequivocal expression of the world community's will to terminate bloodshed in Lebanon and initiate the process of political settlement in that country.

"The Soviet Union," he added, "has already expressed its positive attitude toward the resumption by the Arab League Committee of Three on Lebanon of its peacemaking activity in line with the Casablanca pan-Arab conference's mandate."

"Its committed concrete action plan, we believe, provides a practical chance for ridding Lebanon of the long-term strife," he said.

Roundtable Notes Arms Talks, Cambodia Conflict

LD2609221089 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1700 GMT 24 Sep 89

["International Observers' Roundtable" program with Boris Andrianov, All-Union Radio foreign political commentator Gennadiy Aleksandrovich Vedernikov, international affairs correspondent and Yevgeniy Tikhonovich Grachev, international affairs correspondent]

[Text] [Andrianov] Hello comrades. Let us begin our traditional Sunday meeting at the roundtable. Taking part in it today are my colleagues Gennadiy Aleksandrovich Vedernikov and Yevgeniy Tikhonovich Grachev, both international affairs correspondents.

Not naturally this week the outcome of Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze's visit to the United States of America has drawn much attention. He had a meeting with President Bush, and then had talks with Secretary of State James Baker. Key issues of international politics were discussed, as was the whole package of issues on the agenda of Soviet-U.S. relations. There was discussion on limiting and cuts in weapons, and on regional, bilateral, transnational and humanitarian matters. Several aspects of the economic relations between the Soviet Union and the United States were on the agenda. In the runup to Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze's meeting with George Bush and James Baker the U.S. press attempted to dictate the state of relations between the two countries, and speculated on the possible outcome of the meeting. Various press organs concurred in the opinion that further progress was possible. At the same time, they pointed to something else. One of the brakes on progress in disarmament matters is the U.S. stance at

the talks on nuclear and space weapons. Incidentally, these are due to reopen tomorrow in Geneva.

[Vedenyapin] You know, it seems sensible to summarize here not so much what was achieved at the previous rounds of talks, as what was not achieved and why. And the main thing is to ponder what is required in order to achieve a radical turnaround in the business of disarmament.

I should recall that on 7 September the latest round of talks began in the Austrian capital between the Warsaw Pact countries and NATO on the reduction of armed forces and weapons in Europe.

[Grachev] It should be said here that the United States and NATO generally have at long last moved away from their previous stance at the talks, by which only such types of weapons as tanks, artillery and armored vehicles—by and large the weapons types that the Warsaw Treaty Organization has more of—would be subject to reduction. Meanwhile the strike aircraft and combat helicopters, of which NATO has substantially more, would remain quite untouched. And the number of troops would be totally unrestricted. Of course, one cannot but welcome the North Atlantic Bloc's move away from its totally unrealistic stance. But nevertheless, the progress of the Vienna talks shows that the present position of the NATO countries retains many elements of what I would call a unilateral approach. There are attempts to remove from the limitations some types of weapons of which they have more, and at the same time, conversely, include those types in which the Warsaw Treaty Organization has superiority. And this despite the fact that they are of a purely defensive nature—air defense fighters, for instance. There is also a desire not to limit the number of troops of the other NATO countries aside from the United States, including those deployed outside national borders.

[Andrianov] I propose that we do not, at the present moment, delve into the specifics of the differences that remain in Vienna. But one thing must be acknowledged: NATO's fundamental approach to the issue of military confrontation in Europe has remained unchanged, unlike the approach of the Warsaw Pact countries. Why is this so? Attempts are made to explain this by claiming that, ever since it emerged, the alliance of Western democracies has been defensive in terms of its goals. And so, it is maintained, the North Atlantic Alliance has no need to alter the course of its military planning. So the way it works out then, only the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Treaty Organization are obliged to do this. Well, it is hardly necessary to reiterate for the umpteenth time that the Warsaw Pact, too, was created for exclusively defensive ends. Generally speaking, there has never been any great advantage in trading this sort of arguments.

Alas, protestations remain just protestations, while in the opinion of NATO it is military capability rather than intention that is of genuine significance. Incidentally, I believe it is fairly easy to sort out what, for instance, nonoffensive defense actually is. It is a different matter entirely when the armed forces of one side or the other are organized as though they are working on the principle that the best form of defense is attack. In this instance, of course, no protestations of peaceableness will help. Meanwhile, if we take even just authoritative Western sources, to say nothing of the information which we have at our disposal, then their information illustrates quite clearly the fallacy of the attempts to convince the opposing side that, unlike us and our Warsaw Pact allies, the armed forces of NATO countries are organized in line with the concept of nonoffensive defense.

[Vedenyapin] Here I would mention a report published last year by the U.S. Congress' House of Representatives Armed Services Committee. It compares the military doctrines of the two alliances, it analyzes the opportunities for a reduction in military confrontation on the continent of Europe. Anyway, the authors of the report acknowledge frankly that NATO's armed forces reflect the very concept that a good attack is the best form of defense. As you can see, the U.S. legislators do not shy away from describing the NATO concept of defense as one that is capable not just of a counterattack, but of a good attack. Something which, I should note, does not rule out the possibility of a so-called preventive strike. With this conclusion in mind, the authors of the study were quite pessimistic in their assessment of our readiness—the readiness of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the Warsaw Pact—to restructure our armed forces on the principle of exclusively nonoffensive defense.

As you know, the progress was wide of the mark. Shortly after this report was published, our country—and subsequently our allies—announced, and are now unilaterally implementing, major steps to alter the structure and reduce the size of our armed forces. At the same time, as you well know, we put forward an extensive program for the Warsaw Pact and NATO both to reduce their weapons and armed forces and to make such structural alterations to the latter as would bring them properly into line with the defensive nature of the military doctrines of the two alliances. In other words, into line with the declarations. And so you will agree that there is a fundamental difference in our approaches to the issue of overcoming military confrontation in Europe. While we are prepared—and not merely in words—to eliminate the disparity in those parts of the military doctrines that refer to military technology, it must be stated candidly that such a readiness is considerably less visible on the NATO side.

[Grachev] You know, comrades, it would evidently be worthwhile looking at Washington's stance and that of a number of other NATO states on issues relating to tactical nuclear weapons—that is, weapons with a range of up to 500 kilometers. It is well known that the United States has not counted that a decision on this matter be made immediately. It has been postponed until 1992. But Washington and London are refusing even to discuss the question of tactical nuclear weapons with us until

such time as an agreement on conventional weapons is drawn up and signed. Many people believe that this will come to pass next year. For the time being, then the United States is continuing to work on a new missile with a range of more than 400 km, apparently as a replacement for the Lance missiles with which it is currently armed and which have a range of 120 km. In the meantime, within the framework of the existing Soviet-U.S. treaty, we are scrapping all our missiles known as SS-23, with a range of up to 500 km, even though technically they do not come under the provisions of the treaty. As you can see, at times the sticking point is not differences on individual details, but the two sides different fundamental approaches to the existence of this or that problem. In effect, we are talking about the presence or absence of political will.

[Andriamov] Well, what can I say? Probably that the conclusion drawn at the recent Congress of USSR People's Deputies is being borne out. The conclusion was that, alas, there are still no guarantees that the incipient positive changes in the sphere of disarmament and increased confidence will not go into reverse. Evidently, such guarantees will appear only when the new political mentality comes to reign supreme in international affairs and when our partners in negotiations likewise work on the principle that security is indivisible and can only be assured through political means. Of course, a substantial change of political tack is required for this. In this sense our active and constructive actions on the international scene are designed to help toward this. They are designed to facilitate this. The vacation is over, one might say. Ahead lies intensive work to resolve problems, in the solution of which the role of mankind has an interest.

[Gratchev] You know, I should like to lend support to the idea of problems in which the whole of mankind has an interest, and remind you of the problem of the Near East. For decades now the Near East has been one of the hottest spots in the world and something of a sore point. To paraphrase a well-known diplomatic expression one might say that the Near East was created to punish foreign ministers. But not just ministers. Heads of state and government, and the entire ruling cabinet of many countries are trying to find a genuine way out of the years-old crisis, which has gone so far that it seems sometimes that it is virtually impossible to find a solution. The periodic upsurges in confrontation and not infrequently extremism, the perpetual instability, the whole chain of conflicts that have become locked in a vicious circle—all of this serves to confirm the plain truth that there is not and simply cannot be any alternative to a political solution to the Near East problem. Furthermore, the military road to a solution has led to the Near East today being one of the most militarized regions in the world. Not for nothing is it known as a powder keg. Judge for yourselves. In the past 5 years, some $93 billion worth of weapons have been supplied to the countries in the region. The total strength of the armed forces and armies of the Near East countries is 4.5 million. These armies have 25,000 tanks and more than 4,000 combat aircraft. And overall, the Near East occupies the second place in the world in terms of the level of militarization. First place remains with the greatest confrontation of the military might of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization. But the pan-European process of reduction in the level of confrontation is gaining in strength—in recent years literally before our very eyes, the trend toward disarmament, security, and cooperation in Europe is becoming a reality. This inspires optimism. And against this background the situation in the Near East appears even more gloomy. The build up of weapons on such a scale there places the very existence of the region's peoples and states in jeopardy, and poses a threat to the world at large.

[Andriamov] In short, what we see here is the general global canon of the nuclear age. Live together or die together.

[Gratchev] Of course. The reality is, however, that some in the Near East continue as before to rely on strong-arm tactics, and to impose their schemes or methods, if you will, of resolving the problems that exist. Moreover, using pressure and diktat. However, it is perfectly obvious that a genuine guarantee of security simply cannot be assured by controlling territory taken by force or by leading in an arms race. Such a guarantee can only be based on removing the basic reasons for the conflict and on the interests of all parties involved in the conflict being balanced equally. That is why the most constructive proposals to settle the Near East conflict entail active diplomatic efforts, as well as an approach toward resolving regional conflicts based on the new political mentality.

[Andriamov] There is much being spoken and written at the moment about the Egyptian Plan for settlement—the so-called Mubarak Plan—just as other plans have been spoken and written about. More than enough of these have been drawn up in the decades of the conflict. There have been several in just the last few years. Suffice it to recall the plans of Jordan, Saudi Arabia, the proposals put forward by the European countries, the proposals of several U.S. Administrations, Israel's plans, the plans of the Palestinians, too. To say nothing of the Soviet proposals that are well-known to the world.

[Vedenyapin] You know, if as many constructive steps were taken as there have been proposals put forward there in the Near East, it seems, prosperity would have prevailed long ago. And the leaders of the countries in the region themselves would be making recommendations on how to solve one or another regional conflict, of which unfortunately there are, frankly speaking, in our time enough.

[Gratchev] That is true. But the Mubarak Plan, about which we began speaking, is interesting and promising. But now, let's go back slightly, to May this year, at that time the so-called Shamir Plan was published and widely publicized in the Western press. I am mentioning it because the Egyptian and Israeli plans have certain

common points and reciprocal links. The Israeli prime minister's plan appeared in the conditions of the Intifadah, the peaceful Palestinian uprising. Mainly it concerns elections in the occupied territories. It is the core of a plan but there are no precise outlines there. As far as the Egyptian president's plan is concerned, it contains 10 points, and in the world it is now called that: Mubarak's Ten Points. It envisages the holding of elections in the Israeli occupied territories and contains a list of all the conditions necessary for them. Moreover Israel must recognize any results of the elections, which must take place under the supervision of international observers, and the principle of land in exchange for peace must be accepted by Israel as part of the general settlement of the problem. I will not expound all the plan's points in detail; they have been published. I just want to stress that in comparison with the Israeli plan proposed earlier, it is specific and that is why it has attracted the attention of practically all interested parties, including the Palestinians. For example, Yasir 'Arafat announced his complete support for the proposed system. It is true that the PLO Executive Committee has decided to pass this plan for examination to its Central Council which will meet in the middle of October, so the Palestinians do not as yet have a united opinion in regard to the Egyptian plan. This is true of the Israeli leadership as well. There is now a heated discussion on this theme going on there. However, the very fact that there are these discussions is not bad. Egyptian officials, in explaining the positions in their working document, stress that they do not contradict the widely recognized idea of convoking an international conference on the Near East. There is no mention at all, it is true, in the text of the Egyptian document of a conference, but at the same time the holding of elections in the occupied territories is not a necessary condition for a final settlement of the conflict.

[Andreanov] So the ambiguous Israeli reaction to the Egyptian plan is yet more evidence of the unwillingness of Tel Aviv to utilize all the possibilities at hand to achieve the main goal.

[Grachev] In general, yes. If the will for peace manifests itself persistently then the goal draws closer, but in Israel they want something else even more—to undermine the Palestinian rising and skillfully skirt around the solution of the basic problem—the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination in the interests of the Palestinians. But nevertheless the ruling circles in Tel Aviv still do not completely reject the new Egyptian plan. There are elements in the Israeli position which give cause to hope. For example, the leaders of the Labor Party are examining Mubarak's proposals as the first chance for achieving progress. The fact that Israeli defense minister Yitzhaq Rabin, after meeting Mubarak, the Egyptian president, in Cairo, supported the Egyptian proposals is particularly significant. And yet he is one of the hawks. His announcement gives hope. However, it is necessary to remember that the whole set of problems in the Near East is a labyrinth through which it is impossible to pass at once. At every turn there is a new problem, but nevertheless movement must be initiated.

[Andreanov] This week saw the beginning of the final stage of the withdrawal of the last Vietnamese volunteers from Cambodia. Up until 21 September only 26,000 remained, and in 2 days the rearguard volunteer subunits will leave the land of ancient Angkor. Thus will end the international mission of Vietnam, which more than 10 years ago came to the help of the Cambodian people in order to save it from the monstrous crimes which were being carried out by the unscrupulous adventurers headed by Pol Pot who had seized the country. They were engaged in the physical extermination of their own people. The special commission which investigated the crimes of the regime of genocide established that in the 3 and a bit years of rule of the Pol Pot clique in Cambodia more than 3.3 million people were exterminated or died from hunger and disease.

[Vedenyapin] Yes, those are terrible figures—the sum total of the bloody tragedy which was played out on Cambodian soil. It works out that every year the Pol Pot administration ended around 1 million lives. Well, think about that. At that time not for nothing did the bourgeois press even call Cambodia the largest death camp of the twentieth century. And in general who knows what would have awaited that people if Pol Pot's power had been retained to the present day. According to some reports Pol Pot intended to leave a population of only 1 million in the country. Well, what can one say here? You know, such plans probably can only be called monstrous.

[Grachev] Certainly, and since you resorted to the language of figures, don't censure me if I quote some too. I will remind you that the Pol Pot executioners tortured almost 800,000 workers and civil servants and about 2 million peasants, more than 200 well-known writers and publicists—the pride of Cambodia's national literature—perished from the cruellest torture, hunger and disease. With a criminally methodical approach, the Pol Pot executioners destroyed medical workers and teachers. Around 20,000 of them died, that is almost 90 percent of those working in health care and education. Ninety-six percent of all Cambodian students, more than 100,000 young men and women, met death in the flower of their youth, creative strengths and noble aspirations.

[Andreanov] Not only people were destroyed by the regime of genocide: having blissfully attempted to begin writing the history of the Cambodian people on a clean page, the Pol Pot regime undermined the economy, and wrecked the social structure of society. It liquidated 6,000 schools, 800 hospitals and all trade establishments. In Pol Pot's Cambodia money was abolished, and the state and transport infrastructure broken. The country literally lay in ruins. It probably suffices to say that Pol Pot's followers destroyed 650,000 houses, 2,000 Buddhist temples and all Muslim and Christian places of worship. So one can imagine what the republic's population had to start from after being liberated with the help of the Vietnamese volunteers, whose contribution to its national rebirth and defense against the hands of

Pol Pot followers who had not been finished off, may be purged by the blood shed on the fields of battle and the many young lives lost.

[Vedenyapin] A lacerated Cambodia has been trying to get to its feet for 10 years, leaning, figuratively speaking, on the shoulder of its friendly neighbour, Vietnam. In nine provinces and the capital itself, Phnom Penh the Vietnamese volunteer subunits carried out their international duty. It is thanks to them and their help in Cambodia factories and works, schools, cinemas and state institutions are now working. The Vietnamese volunteers have many times thwarted the hostile machinations of the hands of Pol Pot followers, and for this reason today people in many areas live practically in complete security. And for this reason the inhabitants of a free Cambodia, with a feeling of truly profound gratitude, are now seeing off their Vietnamese brothers.

[Grachev] Incidentally, the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops will be completed 15 months earlier than the date originally determined and, moreover, it is being carried out outside the framework of the process of the political settlement of the Cambodian conflict. The decision on this—probably many remember—was adopted by three countries of Indochina in April, when Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam published a joint statement about this. It must be said that world public opinion assessed this step extremely highly, considering it a measure leading to the improvement of the political climate in the region and in keeping with the new thinking in international affairs.

[Andrianov] Just now you mentioned fleetingly the process of the political settlement of the Cambodian conflict. Yet it looks very much as though this process has come to a temporary halt. Or rather, it would be more accurate to say that it has been temporarily halted. And the international conference on Cambodia which took place in Paris gave this impression. Although it has been decided to continue the negotiations in the future, it is quite clear what the stumbling block is. It is the issue of the place of one of the Cambodian opposition groupings—the so-called Khmer Rouge, that is the Pol Pot supporters, in the interim period.

The framework of this period is known. The completion of the Vietnamese troop withdrawal and the carrying out of parliamentary general elections. The beginning of the interim period is clearly defined—27 September. But it is the end limit which is so far not clear.

[Vedenyapin] But judge for yourselves. What clarity at all can there be on this business if the Khmer Rouge itself obstinately insists that before the elections a provisional coalition government be formed, moreover, without fail, with the equal participation of all four Cambodian sides. This requirement is also supported by the partners of the opposition coalition Norodom Sihanouk and Son Sann. Assurances that supposedly if the Khmer Rouge is excluded from the composition of the provisional bodies of power, then the outbreak of civil war in Cambodia is inevitable.

[Grachev] Forgive me, but if I may say so, that logic looks like a badly disguised defence of the Pol Pot butchers. And it is not for nothing, of course, that the governments of three indochinese countries argue that the legalization of the Khmer Rouge is not only unacceptable to the Cambodian people, but it is also dangerous in that it may cause serious exacerbation in the military and political situation in the country. It is difficult not to agree with this if we remember that at informal meetings in Jakarta an accord was reached on the necessity of closely linking the Vietnamese troop withdrawal with reliable guarantees not to permit the return of the Pol Pot supporters to power. Therefore, Sihanouk's present position, for example, is evidence of a departure from the accord in Jakarta, and this is, of course, not a good omen.

[Andrianov] However, the Cambodians should know best what can be expected from the Khmer Rouge. You see, the Pol Pot supporters understand that they have nothing to gain from the elections. One must suppose that they are conscious of what black memories they left of themselves in a country where they are hated by practically all Cambodians. Therefore, I think that the Khmer Rouge realize that they have no real chance of acquiring a noticeable place in the political life of Cambodia through voting by the whole people. Hence their reluctance to lay down their arms because they intend to achieve their ends by banking on military force. It was not for nothing, after all, that the Pol Pot supporters at the very beginning of the Paris conference strove to direct this international forum onto an impasse to—as one of them said—clarify relations on the battlefield.

[Vedenyapin] Yes, I am just thinking about their one demand, not to mention at all the word genocide in any document at the international conference on Cambodia. Well, what do all these manoeuvres mean? The intention to gain recognition that they are supposedly not butchers, were not all involved in destroying their people and it is pointless to accuse them because there is nothing to accuse them of. And if there was no genocide, then it follows from the Pol Pot logic that the Cambodian people also did not need assistance from Vietnam. That is how they are attempting to turn obvious facts inside out and make black white and vice versa.

[Grachev] I would like to add that at the present, when there are a matter of days left to the completion of the withdrawal of the Vietnamese volunteers from Cambodia, many, I think, are interested in how the military situation in this country will develop. The leadership of the state of Cambodia expresses confidence that it will remain unchanged. Thus, for instance, speaking this week to foreign journalists, Hun Sen, chairman of the Council of Ministers, stated that if the withdrawal of troops changed the correlation of forces against us, we, undoubtedly, would not have agreed to this. The head of the Cambodian government added: we do not exclude the possibility that the enemy will launch a partisan war, but immediately Hun Sen stressed that if a civil war broke out in Cambodia then, primarily, those countries

which support Pol Pot would be to blame. In order not to allow this, they must stop providing aid to the so-called Khmer Rouge. Hun Sen stated, we expect that these countries will fulfill their promises and wind down military supplies to the Pol Pot supporters after the return of the Vietnamese soldiers to their motherland.

[Andreanov] Well, let us assume for a minute that the situation in Cambodia may get worse. In that case, will the Cambodian Government again appeal to Vietnamese troops for assistance? The question posed is not a rhetorical one. After all, life itself could put it on the agenda.

[Vedernyagin] Incidentally, it was posed in roughly the same way during Hun Sen's meeting with foreign journalists. In the words of the head of the Cambodian government, the military situation in the country cannot worsen if only the opposing Cambodian sides participate in military actions. However, he stressed, if the coalition of opposition forces resorts to foreign assistance, then no one will stop Cambodia from also asking for assistance. That, stated Hun Sen, is our legitimate right, the legitimate right of the people of Cambodia.

[Andreanov] However, so far, I think, there are no grounds for dramatizing the situation. The process of a settlement of the Cambodian conflict is proceeding with complications. This is obvious. But, you see, this settlement meets with the support of the world community. And it shows understanding of the necessity of solving the Cambodian problem only by political means, in the spirit of the new thinking. And that means the settlement must not be conducted for the sake of the settlement itself, but above all in the interests of the Cambodian people and the cause of peace, stability, and cooperation in Southeast Asia.

On this we are concluding our meeting at the roundtable. All its participants thank you for your attention, esteemed comrade listeners. Goodbye. All the best to you.

United Nations Political Debate Begins 25 Sep

LD2509084289 Moscow TASS in English 1124 GMT 25 Sep 89

[Text] New York September 25 TASS—By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Menkiev.

The 44th UN General Assembly begins the general political debate today. Delegation heads of the 159 member states of the United Nations will set out their governments' views on the most important issues of our times.

The Brazilian representative opens the debate, according to long-standing tradition. Brazilian President Jose Sarney will address the community of nations on behalf of his country. A total of 197 speakers, including 17 heads of state and 75 foreign ministers, were registered to participate in the general debate. The debate will last for three weeks.

The Soviet Union attaches great importance to the discussion. In the USSR's opinion, the general debate indicates the attitude of the UN member states to developments in the world and to renovating trends in the organization.

It is pointed out at the UN quarters that this year the situation is better than ever for a fruitful, business-like and non-confrontational discussion. Its beginning coincided in time with the announcement of a new Soviet-American summit late spring-early summer 1990.

Delegates also welcomed the important understandings reached by Eduard Shevardnadze and James Baker at the Wyoming talks. World nations express hope for early cuts in armaments, above all nuclear weapons, and for strengthening international peace and security.

The improvement of relations between the USSR and the United States, and the development of mutual understanding and cooperation between them, has had a very positive influence on the activities of the United Nations, Joseph Garba, president of the 44th General Assembly, told TASS.

The new course set by the Soviet Government is a catalyst for easing tension on the international arena over the past few years, he added. The General Assembly president expressed belief that the debate at the 44th session will further elaborate many important ideas and proposals put forth by the Soviet Union.

Petrovskiy Urges Wider United Nations Role

LD2109124289 Moscow TASS in English 0941 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] New York September 21 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy held a news conference at the UN on Wednesday. He noted that the Soviet delegation at the 44th UN General Assembly session sees its main task in forming efficient mechanisms for ensuring universal security through political means. For this purpose it is necessary to get down to practical implementation of proposals aimed at raising UN efficiency, that is to step up the role of the UN main bodies and to assert the primacy of law in interstate relations.

Special attention should be given to the wider use of UN peace-keeping forces, Petrovskiy noted. "We believe that there is a possibility to use Soviet and UN military contingents for peace-keeping operations," he said.

According to the Soviet delegation, along with efforts to settle conflict and crisis situations in the world, it is high time to think in detail current of how to put into action the mechanism of preventive diplomacy. "We suggested that the systems of early notification and warning about

crises should efficiently operate in all areas of U.N. activity," the deputy minister went on to say.

The new model of military and political security puts forth the question on the transition from the arms economy to the disarmament economy. "In our opinion, the U.N. could actively promote the emerging processes of conversion of the munitions industry to peaceful footing," Petrovskiy noted.

"We favour creating a reliable legal foundation for the international community and are sure that the United Nations can tackle various important problems, including environmental protection, control of terrorism and narcotics trafficking," Petrovskiy said further on.

The deputy minister welcomed stepped-up activities by the Security Council, the General Assembly and other bodies and U.N. specialised agencies and praised the success scored by the U.N. secretary-general in raising the role of the organisation.

To give strong impetus to a practical solution of the global problem of environment protection, a U.N. conference on the environment and development which will be called in 1992, should be held at the top level. "In our opinion, it should conclude agreements on tackling specific problems in this sphere," Petrovskiy pointed out.

Asked about the termination of all nuclear tests, he replied that this is one of the most important problems on the agenda of the General Assembly. The Soviet Union is ready to declare an immediate nuclear tests moratorium, as soon as the United States is ready to do the same.

Joint Working Group on West European Ties Meets

LD2309211889 Moscow TASS in English 2128 GMT 23 Sep 89

[Text] Paris September 24 TASS—The first meeting of the joint working group to develop contacts and cooperation between the Council of Europe and the Soviet Union was held in Strasbourg from September 19-22.

The group was formed under the accord reached during Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with members of the bureau of the ministerial committee of the Council of Europe in July this year.

Areas of cooperation at the inter-governmental level with the most representative West European organisation, uniting 23 European states, were discussed.

The Soviet delegation was led by Ambassador Yuriy Deryabin, head of the European Security and Cooperation Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry, the delegation of the secretariat of the Council of Europe—by head of the Political Department G.P. Furrer.

Meetings were held with Chairman of the Ministerial Committee, Foreign Minister of Norway Thorvald Stoltenberg, Chairman of the Parliamentary Assembly Anders Bjoerck, General Secretary of the Council of Europe Catherine Lalumiere.

The Soviet representatives were informed about activities of a number of specialised agencies of the Council of Europe.

The next meeting of the joint working group will be held in Moscow in October.

Quayle Attends International Meeting in Tokyo

LD2309230189 Moscow TASS in English 1926 GMT 23 Sep 89

[Text] Tokyo September 23 TASS—A two-day conference of the International Democrat Union (IDU), which ended in Tokyo today, passed the "Tokyo statement" giving an appraisal of the present-day international situation by leaders of the conservative world.

The participants in the conference of the IDU, uniting 27 conservative and right-centrist parties in the first place of Western countries, discussed East-West relations, arms control, global economic, ecological and other problems.

The forum was attended by U.S. Vice President Dan Quayle, British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu and a number of other prominent Western politicians.

Analysing the world situation, the participants in the IDU conference note that "far-reaching changes" are under way in our world. "As negotiations on reductions of nuclear weapons have started to yield tangible results, serious efforts are being undertaken to solve or control different regional conflicts", the authors of the statement say. Meanwhile they are trying to present positive changes in the world exclusively as a merit of conservative parties and the so-called "firm policies of the Western states."

The undisguised anti-socialist direction is the main feature of the "Tokyo statement", accusing socialism of all sins, that puzzling even many Western correspondents who provided a coverage of the work of the conference.

Giving an appraisal of Soviet perestroika, the authors of the statement welcome "the attempts to reform the Soviet system", and assert meanwhile that transformations in socialist countries can bring only temporary improvements." Nevertheless they stress that the changes taking place in the socialist states "will diminish mistrust, thus leading to marked improvement in east-west relations."

The leaders of the conservative parties meanwhile express absolute determination to maintain "adequate deterrence" and underline their continuing support for the doctrine of "nuclear deterrence."

United States & Canada

Bush Says Summit Agreement 'Good News'

PM2509081589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "G. Bush: 'This Is Good News'"]

[Excerpt] Washington, 24 Sep—U.S. President G. Bush announced Saturday that a new Soviet-U.S. summit meeting will be held in late spring or early summer 1990. Addressing journalists at his family estate in Kennebunkport, Maine, where he is vacationing, G. Bush announced that this decision was agreed to in Wyoming during the 2 days of talks between J. Baker and E.A. Shevardnadze. The timeframe of the meeting has been set, he emphasized, and Washington would be a suitable location for the meeting.

"This is good news," the head of the U.S. Administration went on to say. "I think that people all over the world will be very pleased with this announcement."

G. Bush expressed hope that the U.S.-Soviet summit meeting will produce agreements on further arms reductions. At the same time, he noted that this meeting need not necessarily end with the signing of an arms control agreement. "I do not share the view that summit meetings must have the aim of achieving arms control agreements, but we do intend to act along this avenue with full determination, we intend to advance by all possible means so as to achieve further arms reductions." [passage omitted]

Scowcroft Praises U.S.-Soviet Talks

LD2509084089 Moscow TASS in English 0806 GMT 25 Sep 89

[Text] Washington September 25 TASS—Brent Scowcroft, assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, has evaluated positively the latest Soviet-American talks at foreign ministers' level.

He told pressmen at Kennebunkport, Maine, where President George Bush is now spending his holidays, that although there were still acute problems between the two sides, an absolutely obvious progress has been achieved.

According to U.P. Brent Scowcroft dwelt on the question of cutting down conventional armaments and noted that the Soviet side was now on record that the schedule of negotiations, offered by the Bush administration and providing for the achievement of an agreement by next May, may prove to be feasible.

Baker Comments on Bush's Meeting With Gorbachev

PM2709153589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Unsigned own correspondent dispatch: "Meeting in Washington. Talks in Wyoming"]

[Excerpts] Following the conclusion of the White House meeting between E.A. Shevardnadze and President G. Bush, the Soviet foreign minister talked with reporters who were keenly interested in whether a specific date had been set for the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. [passage omitted]

The secretary of state also gave his assessment of the White House meeting. He announced that the letter received from the Soviet leader was in reply to a message sent by President Bush to the Kremlin 3 months ago, in which the head of the U.S. Administration expressed the wish to achieve progress on the full range of arms control questions. According to J. Baker, he believes that Gorbachev's letter is, on the whole, a positive reply to Bush's message. "Although the talks are complex," the secretary of state emphasized, "and many difficult problems still have to be resolved, we are very hopeful that real progress will continue."

After announcing that questions of the internal situation in the Soviet Union were also discussed at the White House, Baker said: "The President made it very clear that we are profoundly interested in what is happening in the Soviet Union. He confirmed our commitment to the success of perestroyka." He was asked: "In the administration's view, could perestroyka succeed without Gorbachev?" Baker replied: "The position of the President, the position of the administration is this. We wish for perestroyka to succeed, and we also wish for the general secretary to succeed because, frankly speaking, we believe his success is very important for the success or otherwise of perestroyka."

It is, however, evident from J. Baker's statement that Washington is not inclined to move further than expressing support for the perestroyka processes or further than what the secretary of state called "technical advice." A high-level administration spokesman later explained that this means the opportunity to share with the Soviet Union "business experience in conditions of an open economy."

Bush Sees Favorable Prospects for Soviet-U.S. Ties

LD2709151789 Moscow TASS in English 1518 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] Washington September 27 TASS—U.S. President George Bush said today he saw a historic opportunity to develop relations with the USSR following his talks here with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. Speaking in an interview with ABC television, Bush also said that favourable prospects were opening up now for a future U.S.-Soviet summit.

Shevardnadze 'Candid' on Ethnic Problems

LD2309095489 London DAILY TELEGRAPH in English 11 Sep 89 p 11

[By Ian Brodie in Jackson, Wyoming: "Kremlin's Ethnic Errors Admitted by Shevardnadze"]

[Text] Mr Eduard Shevardnadze has given American officials a remarkably candid account of the Soviet Union's past mistakes in dealing with its restive nationalities and has indicated the Soviet Socialist Republics will be granted far more autonomy in future.

The Soviet Foreign Minister admitted there had been a big gap between the reality and the principles of the Soviet Constitution which provides for a great deal of autonomy for the republics.

His comments came at a time when protests and uprisings in the annexed Baltic republics and other areas where ethnic Russians are in a minority have reached a level where many observers wonder about Mr Gorbachev's chances of survival as Soviet leader.

But Mr Shevardnadze expressed no such qualms during an intense two-hour discussion on the nationalities problem with the United States Secretary of State, Mr James Baker, as they flew from Washington to Wyoming.

The two sides will spend two days of talks on world issues, including strategic arms talks which the Soviets say are deadlocked over disagreements about star wars and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

A senior American official said the two spent the entire time on the plenum of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee, held earlier this week in Moscow, and the decisions it made on the future of Soviet nationalities.

Mr Shevardnadze, a Georgian, explained that when the Soviet Union was founded the central government was forced to exert a high degree of control over the republics, contrary to the principles of the Constitution, in order to get the Soviet economy rolling.

What Moscow had failed to realise was that this relationship had outlived its usefulness.

The Soviet Minister also confirmed that Moscow is thinking of raising capital by issuing bonds and wanted to know about interest rates and cried what the Americans considered a low figure, given the risks of inflation.

Helped by two Soviet economists, the minister talked about ways to effect monetary stabilisation in the Soviet Union and wondered how the rouble could eventually become a convertible currency.

Shevardnadze-Baker Talks Begin in Wyoming

TASS Rounds Up 1st Day

LD2309095589 Moscow TASS in English 0855 GMT 23 Sep 89

[Text] Jackson Hole, Wyoming, September 23 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker had their first day of talks on Friday.

During the official conversations, which lasted a total of more than 11 hours, they considered a wide range of issues on the agenda of Soviet-U.S. relations, which is being extended and filled with new content.

Shevardnadze substantiated and developed a number of basic ideas concerning arms control and reductions, set forth in Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's letter delivered by the minister to President George Bush at a White House meeting on September 21.

The new Soviet major initiatives and proposals, related to the subject of the talks on nuclear and space weapons, are opening real possibilities for avoiding unjustified delays and making serious headway towards the conclusion of a treaty on limitation and reduction of strategic offensive armaments in conditions of maintaining strategic stability.

The Soviet foreign minister also set forth new elements promoting the solution of some difficult problems at the Vienna talks on cuts in conventional armed forces in Europe and aimed at the accomplishment by the sides of the task of concluding an agreement within six to 12 months.

'Businesslike' Talks Proceeding

LD2309104589 Moscow TASS in English 0826 GMT 23 Sep 89

[Text] Jackson Hole, Wyoming September 23 TASS—By TASS Special Correspondents Oleg Polyakovskiy and Nikolay Turkatenko:

Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker held their talks here in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere.

During a briefing for the press, a Soviet delegation spokesman noted that they had spoken very positively of the progress made in Soviet-American relations, while a U.S. delegation spokesman stressed the unprecedented openness marking the negotiations, which, he said, testified to improvement in every aspect of the bilateral relationship.

Judging by reports from both delegations, the negotiators made headway towards resolving a whole number of major issues.

By Friday night, they had outlined specific steps to help tackle the key issue: that of working out a strategic offensive arms treaty.

All indications are that on Saturday, the final day of the talks, the sides will sign at least two related documents.

One will concern verification arrangements to monitor compliance with the strategic arms treaty, while the other will record their mutual agreement to notify each other of maneuvers involving strategic forces.

In addition, the Soviet delegation applied efforts towards an early solution to such a complicated issue directly connected with strategic arms limitation as sea-launched cruise missiles.

However, the U.S. side, judging by remarks by its representatives at the briefing, is still unprepared for a specific binding accord limiting such missiles, claiming that it would be unverifiable. This notwithstanding, the Americans agreed to continue working on the problem.

The U.S. side hailed as a "positive development" the fact that, according to an American delegation spokesman, the Soviet delegation "Have dropped their linkage between achieving an agreement on START (Strategic Arms Reduction) and achieving a defence in space agreement."

During the first day of the Wyoming talks the sides also paid much attention to looking for ways to create conditions for an early ratification of the 1974 and 1976 agreements limiting the yields of underground nuclear tests.

The United States at its time refused to ratify the agreements on the pretext of their providing for no adequate means of verification.

In order to lift the problem, the Soviet Union suggested that each side should be able to use any verification methods of its own choosing, including on-site inspections. The U.S. delegation did not reject the offer, but neither did it, as yet, give a substantive positive reply.

During the talks on regional problems, which were geared to promoting the cooperation of the two countries in averting conflicts in the planet's trouble spots and settling the existing ones by political means, the Soviet delegation drew special attention to the U.S. posture on Afghanistan.

Continuing U.S. interference in the affairs of that country, including massive supplies of arms to anti-government forces, endangers not only the possibility of an early settlement in Afghanistan but also the "system of the guarantees" of the settlement.

The negotiators will continue their intense work on Saturday, the main results of which are expected to be announced by Shevardnadze and Baker at a news conference after the talks.

Two Agreements Expected

LD1209010389V Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 23 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" program]

[Text] The Wyoming talks between Comrade Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of the State Baker are being held in a businesslike and constructive atmosphere. According to reports received from both delegations, the participants in the talks have made progress in the direction of solving a number of important questions.

As of Friday evening, specific steps have been outlined that are intended to be undertaken by the participants in the talks in order to promote the solution of the key question, that is, working out a treaty on strategic offensive arms.

Everything indicates that on the final day of the talks, the sides will sign at least two documents related to the treaty. One will relate to questions of verification of the implementation of the strategic arms treaty, and the other concerns mutual agreement to notify each other about maneuvers involving strategic armed forces.

Pre-Talks Atmosphere Viewed

PM2209150689V Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Sep 89 Second Edition p 4

[Special Correspondent V. Gan report: "From Rhetoric to Actions"]

[Text] Jackson (Wyoming), 22 Sep—On the map of USSR-U.S. relations a new name has appeared which could well be a positive political starting point in the complex interaction between the two great powers. Located in a green valley among the mountains, the town of Jackson has today become the place which over 2 days will settle the question of whether our two countries move from the stage of exchanging assurances about the constructiveness of their intentions to the stage of fruitful, concrete, and long-awaited actions.

The arrival here of USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze, who will be holding talks with U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker, could mark the turning of a new page in Soviet-U.S. relations. It is no accident that these words of assessment are cautious. On the eve of intensive and detailed conversations it would be absurd, to say the least, to try to predict their results. Judging by the sides' comments, however, the very atmosphere reflecting the talks that are beginning permits a certain optimism. As E.A. Shevardnadze said on his arrival in Jackson after earlier meeting with President Bush at the White House, "the work has already gotten off to a good start." He conveyed to the U.S. President a message from M.S. Gorbachev relating to major questions of arms limitation and reduction. "Now," the Soviet minister noted, "there are good prospects for progress in this most

important sphere as in other spheres of relations. I hope that by the end of the talks the sides can announce important accords."

Secretary of State Baker has spoken in roughly the same vein. "We want to bequeath to future generations," he pointed out, "the openness which has appeared in USSR-U.S. relations."

The agenda is already known—it features the whole range of questions in the dialogue between the two countries including regional problems, humanitarian cooperation, bilateral ties and transnational themes, and economic questions. In other words, it is now down to the mutual desire to discuss and try to unravel all those problems which have been a burden on the development of normal relations between our two countries.

Life in Jackson is now dominated by the Soviet-U.S. meeting. There has been nothing like it in its history. On every street corner the words "Peace and friendship" are displayed in Russian. It looks as though the inhabitants of this small town in Wyoming have grasped with pinpoint accuracy the character of the atmosphere of the talks beginning here.

Shevardnadze, Baker Open Talks

LD2709173089 Moscow TASS in English 1729 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] Washington September 27 TASS—U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze opened a meeting in Jackson Hole, Wyoming.

Before going into the meeting both told reporters they hoped to work out the date and venue of the next Soviet-U.S. summit and were making progress in talks on arms control and other problems.

Shevardnadze said, in particular, that the time had come to proceed from mutual understanding to mutual actions.

Judging from the nature of bilateral meetings, there was complete understanding between the two countries, he added.

Simultaneously with the Baker-Shevardnadze meeting, expert working groups went into their own sessions to discuss the reduction of nuclear, chemical and conventional arms.

USSR-U.S. Farm Working Groups

LD2709221089 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast, video report from Wyoming by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] Negotiations are continuing in the U.S. town of Jackson Hole, in the state of Wyoming, between Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. Here is a report by Boris Kalyagin.

[Kalyagin over video of Shevardnadze and delegations in conference with U.S. delegation] For more detailed discussion of the issues, the members of the Soviet and U.S. delegations split up into five working groups—on disarmament, regional problems, human rights, bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations, and global problems such as environmental protection and the fight against drug abuse. The negotiations are proceeding in a businesslike, frank, and constructive atmosphere. Positive advances have taken shape, including on the issue of arms limitation. [video shows Shevardnadze chatting to Baker, posing for a photocall]

In conversation with James Baker, Comrade Shevardnadze elucidated the positions contained in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's message to President Bush. Our new initiatives essentially remove a number of disputed matters and facilitate reaching an accord on a 50 percent cut in strategic offensive weapons. Of course, there remain no few unresolved problems which are putting a brake on any advance. It is characteristic, true, that a better understanding of one another's positions has been reached on disputed issues. As Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze commented during the negotiations, however, it is not time to move from mutual understanding to mutual actions."

U.S. political circles are following the progress of the current negotiations with close attention. The question of a summit meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and U.S. President George Bush is arousing particular interest. It is expected that the time for holding such a meeting will be set now.

[Unidentified American sitting in front of a VDU, Kalyagin translation superimposed] We must continue dialogue, carry on a discussion, and find out more about one another, dispute, and gradually eliminate the destructive forces which both our countries have in our huge arsenals. When one looks at the negotiations, one involuntarily thinks how brief our life is in comparison with them. One must be more active and do more to develop our relations. This must, however, be done sensibly and honestly.

PRAVDA on First Day of Talks

PM2709085389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian Second Edition 24 Sep 89 p 4

[TASS report: "Wyoming Talks"]

[Text] Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker have finished their 1st day of talks.

During the official conversations, which lasted a total of more than 11 hours, they considered a wide range of issues on the agenda of Soviet-U.S. relations, which is being extended and filled with qualitatively new content.

Shevardnadze substantiated and developed a number of basic ideas concerning arms control and reductions, set

forth in Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev's letter delivered by the minister to President George Bush at a White House meeting on September 21.

The new Soviet major initiatives and proposals related to the subject of the talks on nuclear and space weapons, an opening real possibilities for avoiding unjustified delays and making serious headway towards the conclusion of a treaty on limitation and reduction of strategic offensive armaments on conditions of maintaining strategic stability.

The Soviet foreign minister also set forth new elements promoting the solution of some difficult problems at the Vienna talks on cuts in conventional armed forces in Europe and aimed at the accomplishment by the sides of the task of concluding an agreement within six to 12 months.

E.A. Shevardnadze rendered concrete the principles of the Soviet side's approach to the U.S. initiative on an "open sky," which it supports, and declared the USSR's readiness to take part in an international conference on this issue.

In addition, matters relating to the limitation of nuclear tests, the outlawing of chemical weapons, and the nonproliferation of missiles and missile technology were discussed in a constructive key. The sides voiced their mutual desire to make further efforts right across the disarmament spectrum.

There was a detailed and generally positive exchange of opinions on regional conflicts.

E.A. Shevardnadze stressed that the U.S. increasing involvement in the continued armed struggle in Afghanistan runs counter to its undertakings as a guarantor of the Geneva accords and could lead to the discrediting of the very institution of guarantors of international accords—something that is so important now and potentially very valuable for the future. The Soviet side again called on the United States to contribute toward a political settlement along the lines of national reconciliation in Afghanistan.

The sides expressed satisfaction over the progress made toward political settlement in Central America. E.A. Shevardnadze confirmed that the Soviet Union, with the consent of the Nicaraguan leadership, halted the supply of weapons to Nicaragua some time ago.

In the course of an examination of the situation in the Near East, the two sides' views on the subject of the prospects for Arab-Israeli settlement were compared; there was substantial coincidence in the assessments and approaches to the question of halting the bloodshed in Lebanon.

There was a broad and interested discussion of humanitarian problems and human rights issues. The U.S. side had its attention drawn to the need for certain existing U.S. laws and rules which relate to this sphere to be brought into line with the new realities of Soviet-U.S. relations and also with generally accepted international norms.

E.A. Shevardnadze spoke of the great legislative work being carried out in the Soviet Union which is aimed at reaching the very important goal set by the policy of restructuring, namely, to place the state of affairs with regard to human rights in the USSR on the level of the highest international standards. This is in keeping with the interests and aspirations of the entire Soviet people.

The talks between the ministers will continue.

IZVESTIYA Reports Progress of Talks

PM270918Sep89 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 4

[From Correspondent A. Shalnev report under the general heading "Talks in Wyoming"]

[Text] Jackson, Wyoming—"Businesslike, productive, and constructive"—that was how both the Soviet and U.S. representatives assessed the atmosphere at the talks here between USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker.

The first day of the talks, which are being held at various levels—face to face conversations between the delegation leaders, working groups, and general sessions—gave an opportunity to come very close to achieving at least two major accords in the arms control sphere. Unless something unforeseen happens at the last moment, these accords will be officially announced on Saturday, 23 September. One of them envisages the elaboration and approval of specific measures to verify the implementation of a future agreement on strategic armaments, the second is connected with the exchange of information between the USSR and the United States on major strategic exercises.

True, definite differences persist in the sides' positions. For example, the United States is insisting that verification measures be extended only to mobile-based missiles. In that event the U.S. nuclear strategic arsenals would effectively not be monitored and verification would apply only to the Soviet arsenals. However, we believe, as a high-ranking representative of our Foreign Ministry noted, that verification must apply to all categories of armaments which come under a future treaty.

If the reports circulated here are to be believed, another step of extremely great significance has been taken. As a high-ranking representative of the U.S. Administration has announced, the Soviet minister "rejected the linkage between the conclusion and fulfillment of a treaty on strategic armaments, on the one hand, and the achievement of an accord on space armaments, including the problem of ABM defense, on the other." (That question was not raised at a briefing by our delegation held before the U.S. briefing.—A Sh. note). In the U.S. spokesman's

words, this is a "positive development of events." He went on to stress that the U.S. Administration remains committed to SDI.

The sides have come close to resolving the long-standing question of limiting underground nuclear tests. As is well known, the relevant agreements were concluded back in the mid-seventies but have still not been ratified by the United States. The question of methods to verify their observance had hitherto remained contentious. A compromise acceptable to the two sides has now been outlined here.

In his statement on arriving in Wyoming, the Soviet minister said that "fresh ideas are needed." Indeed, there has been no lack of them. For example, when discussing the question of limiting the proliferation of missiles in the world we proposed thinking about the creation of an international control mechanism—similar, say, to the IAEA.

There has been a detailed discussion on human rights. There are three points of interest here, in my opinion. First. The Soviet minister expressed concern at the fate that sometimes befalls those citizens who have emigrated from the USSR and who should be cared for appropriately, as the U.S. side was told. Second. When the discussion turned to the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which made USSR-U.S. trade and economic relations dependent on the level of emigration from the USSR, the Soviet minister made it clear that the way in which Washington intends to deal with that amendment is a matter purely for the U.S. We were not consulted when that amendment was passed, E.A. Shevardnadze recalled. In my view, that is a qualitatively new feature in our stance. It seems to me that in this way we are having a calming influence on Washington which, by all accounts, would not be at all averse to exploiting the notorious amendment again and making extra political capital out of it.

And the third point of interest. The minister gave the secretary of state a list of U.S. prisoners sentenced to long terms of imprisonment for political activity. The U.S. side promised to examine this list.

TASS on 'Constructive' Talks

LD2709181289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1559 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] Jackson, Wyoming, 27 Sep—TASS special correspondents Ole Polyakovskiy and Nikolay Tsurenko report: The talks in Wyoming between E.A. Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Soviet foreign minister, and J. Baker, U.S. secretary of state, are taking place in a businesslike, constructive atmosphere. A spokesperson for the Soviet delegation noted during a news conference that the ministers "had given a very positive evaluation of progress in Soviet-U.S. relations." And a spokesperson for the U.S. delegation stressed, in particular, "the spirit of unprecedented openness [otkrytost] in which both sides are conducting their talks." This, he said, "demonstrates the improvement in relations between the two countries in all directions."

To judge from reports emanating from both delegations, those taking part in the talks have moved toward the resolution of a whole range of major issues. By last night, specific steps which those taking part in the Wyoming talks plan to take to facilitate the resolution of the key issue—drawing up a treaty on strategic offensive weapons—had taken shape. Judging by all accounts, today, on the final day of the talks, the sides will be signing at least two documents relevant to the treaty. One will concern matters pertaining to monitoring the execution of the treaty on strategic weapons, and the other concerns the sides' reciprocal agreement to inform each other of maneuvers in which armed forces designated strategic take part.

In addition, the Soviet side made efforts directed toward the quickest possible solution of an complex, an issue—bearing directly on strategic arms limitation—as the problem of sea-launched cruise missiles. However, the U.S. side, judging by what representatives of the U.S. delegation said at the news conference, is still not ready to resolve the issue of concluding a specific binding accord in respect of a ceiling for sea-launched cruise missile numbers, stating that observance of such an accord "would be impossible to monitor and verify." Nonetheless, the U.S. side expressed its agreement to continue to work on this problem.

The U.S. side described as a "positive step" by the USSR the fact that, to quote the spokesperson of the U.S. delegation, the Soviet Union "has abandoned linkage of the problem of achieving and observing a treaty on strategic arms with the problem of achieving an agreement on space weapons."

In the course of the first day of the Wyoming talks, the sides paid considerable attention to seeking out ways of solving as soon as possible an important problem as creating the conditions for the ratification of the treaties on the maximum permissible power of underground nuclear blasts which were signed in 1974 and 1976. At one time, the United States failed to ratify these treaties under the pretext of the lack of an appropriate system for verifying the power of the blasts. In order to remove this problem, the USSR proposed using any methods of monitoring and verification asserted by either of the sides, including on-site inspection. The U.S. side did not reject this proposal, but has not yet given any detailed constructive response to it.

In the course of talks on regional problems aimed at establishing cooperation between the two countries in averting and settling conflicts in the "hot spots" of the world politically, the Soviet delegation drew particular attention to the U.S. stance regarding Afghanistan. The U.S. continuing interference in that country's affairs and its mass supplies of weapons to anti-government forces are threatening not only the possibility of the quickest possible settlement on Afghanistan, but also the "maximum of guarantees" of the settlement.

The intensive work of those taking part in the Wyoming talks will continue today and will conclude with a news conference by the ministers, during which the main results of the "Wyoming meeting" will be announced.

Moscow Radio Describes Talks

LD2409125589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0730 GMT 24 Sep 89

[Telephone interview with State Television and Radio correspondent Vladimir Zvyagin in Wyoming by Irina Mishina—live]

[Text] [Mishina] Good day, or rather good morning, Vladimir, can you hear us?

[Zvyagin] Good morning, good morning! It is indeed very early morning here—it's half past three in the morning.

[Mishina] So we are going to be among the first people to review the results of the Soviet-U.S. meeting.

[Zvyagin] Yes. Only recently, a few hours ago, a news conference was held in the little town of Jackson Hole in Wyoming.

[Mishina] Vladimir, I have the following question—I think it will be a natural question for many listeners. Why was Jackson Hole, Wyoming selected as the venue for the talks? What sort of town is it? What is it famous for?

[Zvyagin] It may be famous for other things as well, but among its claims to fame is the fact that here, very near the town of Jackson, is the ranch of James Baker, the U.S. Secretary of State, and his wife Susan. It is a strikingly beautiful place. There are mountains here. The states of Idaho, Colorado and Utah are very near by. It is a strikingly beautiful place, and perhaps the serene and unhurried atmosphere itself made it possible to discuss in detail all the matters that were on the meeting's agenda.

[Mishina] Yes, we know that the Soviet minister brought a large package of proposals with him. Many of the Soviet initiatives dealt with negotiations on nuclear and space armaments and the Vienna talks on the reduction of conventional armed forces. How were the Soviet proposals received, and could you tell us in greater detail about the matters on the agenda of the talks?

[Zvyagin] The range of issues discussed at the meetings between Comrade Shevardnadze and James Baker and in the working groups of experts was unusually broad, and the discussions themselves, in the view of the participants, were frank and very productive. What was discussed specifically? A memorandum on chemical weapons was signed, which provides for wide-scale reciprocal verification [proverka] and an exchange of data between our countries. A wide-ranging agreement was signed on different measures for verifying [proverka] the fulfillment of future treaties, and in particular, after detailed discussion in Geneva, for the establishment of on-site reciprocal inspection [proverka] points. In addition to this, as part of this verification [proverka] program, it was decided that both sides would inform one another of all major strategic maneuvers using long-distance bombers capable of carrying nuclear weapons with at least 2 weeks' notice.

There was discussion of the problems of the reduction of armaments and armed forces in Europe, and issues to do with regional tension around Afghanistan, in Central America, and in the Near East. There were in-depth discussions on the problems of the environment, which directly affect the interests of both our peoples today. The struggle against international terrorism and the protection of human rights were discussed. Another very interesting matter was the discussion of a proposal on open skies—this led to the idea, supported by both the Soviet and U.S. participants in the talks, of holding in the very near future an international conference involving the member-states of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. However, the most important thing, it seems, was an agreement to speed up the conclusion of a treaty on the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons, without linking it directly with the 1972 ABM Treaty. Mind you, on this latter point the sides still have certain fundamental differences of view.

[Mishina] Vladimir, one can also naturally count among the results of the meeting the attainment of agreement on future Soviet-U.S. summit?

[Zvyagin] Undoubtedly so. I think that here many of the participants in the meeting, U.S. Secretary of State Baker himself above all, on the U.S. side have expressed satisfaction that this accord was reached. The point is that although the problems of military detente traditionally take a prominent place in Soviet-U.S. talks, and this was already Comrade Shevardnadze's fifth meeting with Secretary of State Baker alone, increasing attention is devoted, and will undoubtedly be devoted in the future, to matters of cooperation in the broadest sense of the word. And at the news conference in Wyoming just a few hours ago, both Eduard Shevardnadze and Mr Baker noted that the period of open confrontation between our countries was gradually receding into history, while the prospects for real and constructive activity for the sake of peace were becoming increasingly tangible. Wyoming has helped—and this was said a great deal—to strengthen working relations between the leaders of our two foreign policy departments, and, by all accounts, has paved the way for the summit. It has been announced that it—the next Soviet-U.S. summit—should take place in late spring/early summer next year.

[Mishina] We know that the talks were quite difficult. They continued for 11 hours a day. Did the viewpoints of the sides coincide on everything?

[Zvyagin] I have already said that on one of the issues—in particular on one—the sides still have fundamental differences. They remain above all in the fact that the United States has until recently insisted on the possibility of a so-called broad interpretation of the 1972 ABM Treaty, and thus the possibility of testing components of the Star Wars program in near-earth orbit. Our country's

position was that before signing an agreement on the reduction of inter-continental ballistic missiles, the United States should—if it is to continue developing new types of armaments under this Star Wars program—agree to do so only within the framework of the ABM Treaty. The present compromise—and the participants also said this at the news conference—is one which, although our country will in the future demand strict observance of the treaty, gives both sides an opportunity to actively pursue the working out of the details and preparation for the signing of an agreement on strategic weapons in the next few months, possibly even during next year's summit.

[Mezhina] Vladimir, I realize that it is very difficult now to draw conclusions and talk about the reaction of the press, but over the last few days you have worked with many American and other foreign journalists. How have they reacted to the meeting, to the talks?

[Zvyagin] Early this Sunday morning, it is probably still too early to talk about a broad reaction from the American news media. But the first reaction to the report, the report on the results of the talks and on the forthcoming summit, has, as a whole, been extremely optimistic. Television commentators have talked about the importance of continuing the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, and even the small number of conservatively-minded observers who mentioned and discussed this matter on Saturday evening were forced to agree that our country was firmly fulfilling all its agreements and treaties and was not seeking any one-sided advantage, and that much now depended on the breadth of approach of our countries, on how broadly and comprehensively, with a view to the 21st century, our countries would approach the strategy of developing relations in the world, bearing in mind the genuine interests of the world community of nations. A total of 59 treaties and agreements are today already operating between our countries, and they are all geared to strengthening security and cooperation in the world. In this sense, everyone here is awaiting with great interest the speeches at the general political discussion at the General Assembly of sch opens at the UN on Monday. U.S. President Bush is to speak there on Monday, and on Tuesday Comrade Shevardnadze, our country's foreign minister. Evidently, a more detailed review of the results of the Wyoming meeting will come then.

[Mezhina] One way or another, can we without doubt speak of substantial contributions to the development of Soviet-U.S. relations, to rendering them more healthy, to their improvement?

[Zvyagin] Without question, and one can already say that in this sense the Wyoming meeting has been a milestone in the development of Soviet-U.S. relations.

[Mezhina] Thank you very much, Vladimir, for your detailed report. All the best to you.

Further on Shevardnadze Talks in U.S.

LD2909211589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Our correspondent Boris Kalyagin reports from the U.S. State of Wyoming. [Video shows Shevardnadze and Baker walking in woodland]

[Kalyagin] The talks between Shevardnadze, USSR Foreign Affairs Minister and U.S. State Secretary Baker have ended. It may be said without exaggeration that the sides subjected the main problems both of international life and of Soviet-U.S. relations to all-round analysis. Many new views and initiatives were expressed which removed contentious issues or alleviated their resolution.

Six new agreements between the USSR and the United States were signed on the conclusion of the discussions. They embrace various spheres, from an accord on mutual trips by Soviet and U.S. inhabitants in the Bering Straits region to important agreements in the disarmament sphere. Of these it is necessary to single out an agreement on timely notifications of major strategic exercises and an accord on the principles of implementing experimental strategic arms control measures. [Video shows Baker and Shevardnadze seated with advisors at a table in the open against a backdrop of mountainous scenery, signing documents, shaking hands, then Shevardnadze addressing a press conference]

At the start of his press conference, Comrade Shevardnadze made a statement.

[Begin recording] [Shevardnadze] Chernobyl (words indistinct) new positions of the sides. Their attention and political orientation placed on the agenda the matter of holding another summit-level meeting as an effective means for ensuring breakthroughs in the main areas of Soviet-U.S. relations. It was agreed that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Bush will meet at the end of spring/beginning of summer next year. This accord reflects the certainty of the sides about the opportunity for achieving major mutually-acceptable accords and substantive progress as a whole in the relations between our two countries. Under discussion, first and foremost, is the sphere of disarmament and security.

At the talks with State Secretary Mr Baker, with whom—I want to say immediately—I established very good, businesslike and constructive relations, key aspects of the problem of nuclear and space weapons were considered. The sides stated that taking into account the new, and compromising amendments introduced by them in their positions, the preparation and signing of a treaty on 50-percent reductions in strategic offensive weapons appears to be realistic. [end recording]

[Kalyagin] Then Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze answered journalists' questions. [Video shows Kalyagin himself speaking from the floor]

[Begin recording] [Kalyagin] Eduard Amvrosiyevich, you have spoken about the new ideas and points contained in the letter from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to President Bush, which might help to resolve a number of contentious issues. But what was the U.S. side's attitude to these proposals?

[Shevardnadze] (Probably) this question may be exhaustively answered by the state secretary who will be speaking to you in 10-12 minutes' time. But we gained the impression that there is great interest, that a detailed study of our ideas and proposals is under way, and, on the whole, unless I am mistaken, the reaction is positive. [end recording]

[Kalyagin] Then there was a press conference by State Secretary James Baker. In his preliminary speech Baker stressed that Soviet-U.S. relations have entered a new phase. We have moved, he said, from confrontation to dialogue. And now we are moving on to cooperation in joint actions with regard to common problems, and with regard to a broad range of matters which were on the agenda of the talks. The state secretary pointed out that the meeting which had taken place was productive. [video shows woman journalist asking question from the floor, then Kalyagin again asking a question] Then James Baker answered journalists' questions. A question from the "Vremya" program.

[Begin recording] [Kalyagin speaking from floor in English with superimposed Russian translation] Mr Secretary (?as heard) we have learned about the new ideas and proposals put forward in the letter from Chairman Gorbachev to President Bush. What is the attitude of the U.S. Administration to these ideas?

[Baker] I think that it is clear from my preliminary speech that we received many new proposals, and our attitude to the letter from Mr Gorbachev is very positive. I think that some of these proposals made it possible to achieve specific successes at the present meeting even. At the same time, we imagine that our side also put forward new ideas. We took a number of important political decisions which made it possible to make progress in other matters. I'm speaking in particular about the matter of nuclear tests, which had been deadlocked for 15 years. [end recording]

START-Space Pacts Linkage Dropped

LD1209230589 Tokyo KYODO in English 0620 GMT 21 Sep 89

[By Shoji Yonezawa]

[Text] Jackson Hole, Wyoming, Sep 22 (KYODO)—The Soviet Union, in a major policy shift, told the United States on Friday it will no longer link an agreement on Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) with a space defense pact.

The shift came on the opening day of a two-day ministerial meeting here between U.S. Secretary of State James Baker and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze.

A senior U.S. official said the fresh Soviet proposal "looks like a positive development" but will require close examination.

A senior Soviet official, meanwhile, told reporters the two countries have reached a basic agreement on verification of nuclear testing.

Under the agreement, the official said, both countries can pick one or a combination of three methods under discussion—seismic, seismic and on-site inspection.

The Soviet decision to drop the linkage between a START agreement and a space defense pact surprised U.S. officials who had thought the Soviets would continue their opposition to the Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) or "Star Wars" as a violation of the ABM treaty.

U.S. arms negotiators declined to speculate on the impact of the new Soviet position on START and other arms control and reduction talks between the two superpowers.

The senior U.S. official said Baker reiterated President George Bush's strong commitment to SDI, an antimissile program in space.

The U.S. has long maintained that it has the right to pursue SDI "within the obligations of the ABM treaty."

The Soviet official, commenting on the agreement on nuclear testing verification, said his country considers the seismic method as being more "accurate and cheaper" than the other two.

But a senior U.S. State Department official asserted that the seismic or hydrodynamic (hydrodynamic) method is "the most accurate and the most secure." In what a Soviet official described as "a very important accommodation for the American side," the Shevardnadze team proposed a limitation on sea-launched cruise missiles (SLCM's) "in association with, but outside" of a START treaty.

The Kremlin had long insisted on a separate limitation on SLCM's, along with a quota of the 6,000 warheads within the framework of a START pact.

The U.S. is opposed to such a limit due to its long-standing policy of neither confirming or denying the existence of such missiles on U.S. ships, among other reasons.

Baker and Shevardnadze opened their fourth ministerial meeting at Jackson Lake Lodge and the ABK Ranch.

U.S. and Soviet officials said the two leaders also discussed regional conflicts in Kampuchea, Afghanistan, Central America, Ethiopia and other trouble spots around the world.

A Soviet official said Baker and Shevardnadze discussed "the prospect for a summit" between Bush and President Mikhail Gorbachev.

Baker and other U.S. officials have suggested that a summit may take place in the United States in the first half of next year. Soviet officials, who hope for an early summit, said they are studying the American suggestion.

In discussing regional issues, a U.S. official said Baker called on the Soviet Union to apply its "new thinking" to resolve the regional conflicts in Kampuchea, Afghanistan, Nicaragua and other war-torn countries of the world.

He also complained about "a disturbing flow of arms" to these countries from the Soviet Union and its satellite states such as Cuban shipments to Nicaragua, according to the U.S. official.

The Shevardnadze team, in response to frequent U.S. criticism over human rights violations in the Soviet Union, presented a list of 40 political prisoners in the U.S., including a person sentenced to 70 years in prison for participating in demonstrations.

State Department spokeswoman Margaret Tutwiler acknowledged that there was limited discussion about the list which Soviet officials said was compiled by American human rights activists.

A Soviet official said the Soviet Union will enact human rights legislation in the near future to bring its laws and regulations into line with international standards.

"We are doing (that) for ourselves," he said.

The U.S. has refused to give the Soviet Union trade concessions unless it improves its human rights record as mandated by the Jackson-Vanik amendment. Baker and Shevardnadze also discussed measures to curb chemical weapons and nuclear proliferation.

Bush are scheduled to take up transnational issues such as the environment, terrorism and drugs on Saturday before concluding their two-day meeting here.

Shevardnadze Holds News Conference in Wyoming

PM250948Moscow Moscow PRAVDA in Russian Second Edition 25 Sep 89 pp 5,6

[TASS report: "From Mutual Understanding to Cooperation"]

[Text] **From mutual understanding to cooperation**

Jackson, Wyoming, 24 Sep—The talks between E.A. Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker have ended here. E.A. Shevardnadze summed up the results of the talks at a news conference. He said:

I am glad to meet you in Wyoming. We have not met before in a place such as Jackson Hole. (This is what the valley is called where the meeting took place) in such conditions as here.

The talks, which have taken place over the last few days in Washington and here, in Jackson Hole, have led the Soviet-U.S. dialogue towards a new stage.

The last 8 months have been for us and the new U.S. Administration a period of mutual adaptation. The natural process of determining political priorities, of studying and selecting variants, and of forming ideas of what is possible and achievable has continued. Contacts, on the highest level, have been maintained between Moscow and Washington all this time.

The sides approached the present round already having chalked up considerable experience in contacts and an understanding that they can and must go further in the development of their relations.

As you know, we conveyed to President Bush a message from M.S. Gorbachev. In this message the Soviet leader spoke in favor of starting to resolve matters that are on the Soviet-U.S. agenda. M.S. Gorbachev set forth new ideas and notions which will allow mutually acceptable approaches, leading to agreement and to accords on a series of major problems, to be found.

The conversation with President Bush showed that the U.S. leadership also intends to work actively toward achieving practical results which expand the base of Soviet-U.S. cooperation in various spheres.

The sides' new positions and their intentions and political orientation have put on the agenda the issue of holding the next summit meeting, as an effective means of securing breakthroughs in the basic avenues of Soviet-U.S. relations.

It was agreed that M.S. Gorbachev and President Bush will meet at the end of the spring/beginning of summer next year.

This agreement also reflects the sides' certainty of the possibility of reaching major agreements and substantial progress as a whole in relations between our two countries.

This relates first and foremost to disarmament and security.

Key aspects of the problem of nuclear and space weapons were examined in the negotiations with Secretary of State Baker, with whom I established good businesslike relations [delovoy]. The sides stated that taking into account the new compromise amendments they have introduced into their positions, preparation and signing of a treaty on 50 percent cuts in strategic offensive weapons are a realistic prospect.

Allow me to give a brief review of the issues examined.

Disarmament. We devoted two rounds of conversation to this. The recurring theme was the necessity for bold political steps.

At the negotiations in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons, there are still a number of differences; these are hampering the successful conclusion of these negotiations in the near future. Taking this as his point of departure, M.S. Gorbachev put forward in his message to President Bush a number of proposals, which we have discussed.

The greatest divergences in our views remained on the issue of antimissile defense and space. Taking account of the fact that consideration of this issue reached deadlock because of differences in the sides' conceptual approaches, we said that we were ready to sign and ratify the treaty on strategic offensive weapons even if no agreement has been reached on the antiballistic missile problem by the time it has been fully drawn up. This is on the condition, however, that the sides continue to observe the antiballistic missile treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972. The provision on the right to withdraw from the strategic offensive weapons treaty in the event of one of the sides failing to observe the ABM Treaty must, of course, be maintained.

It was also proposed that a uniform understanding of the activities banned and permitted by the treaty should be agreed upon at the talks on nuclear and space weapons.

As you realize, it is a matter of untying, on the basis of the Washington formula of 1987, the main knot that is holding back the talks.

A further serious step concerns the Krasnoyarsk radar station. We have decided to eliminate this facility entirely. We expect the U.S. side to remove our concern regarding its radar stations in Greenland and Great Britain.

We have also put forward new proposals which in our view should help resolve the problems of long-range air- and sea-launched cruise missiles.

We regard it as a cause for satisfaction that the secretary of state has said the United States is withdrawing its proposal to ban mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Having examined U.S. President G. Bush's idea of measures for verification [kontrol] and stability before a strategic offensive weapons treaty is signed, we have come to the conclusion that the implementation of such measures could be useful. In the course of the meeting an agreement was signed which gives the USSR and United States delegations at the Geneva talks a good foundation for working out specific measures.

An agreement on notification of major exercises by strategic forces has also been signed.

On Nuclear Tests. At the present stage we have the task of preparing for ratification the Soviet-U.S. treaties on the limitation of underground nuclear weapons tests, and on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes, signed in 1974 and 1976 respectively.

Here serious steps were made toward accommodating each other, and several complex technical questions of verification [kontrol] were agreed upon. Thus, the path to putting these two important treaties into action is now open.

They may be signed in the course of the summit meeting.

Chemical Weapons. In the conversation with President Bush and during negotiations with the secretary of state we gave great attention to the problem of banning them. We managed to make progress.

Mr Baker and I signed a memorandum of understanding on a bilateral experiment on verification [kontrol] and on the exchange of information. Its main aim is to facilitate rapid drafting, signing, and ratification of the convention. The USSR and United States are exchanging in two stages extremely exhaustive information on their chemical warfare potentials. During the first stage, an exchange of visits will take place at a number of chemical weapons production and storage sites, and also civilian chemical enterprises. During the second stage, the correctness of the information will be checked [proverka] by on-site inspections, moreover not only at announced sites, but also with the aid of inspections on demand. Furthermore, and this is essential, the inspections will begin even before the conclusion of the drafting of the convention.

We have also adopted a special statement on the problem of chemical weapons, in which we have announced our common resolution to strive for the soonest possible conclusion of the convention.

Conventional Weapons. We discussed with President Bush and Secretary of State Baker in broad conceptual terms the possibilities of removing the hindrances on the path to a rapid conclusion of the agreement on a substantial cut in troops and conventional weapons.

The President, as is known, proposed doing this within 6 to 12 months. We have accepted this challenge.

Now, in our view, some kind of strategy for accelerating the Vienna negotiations is needed. We have proposed to the United States and the NATO countries that we carry out a conference of the heads of state of Europe, the United States, and Canada in the second half of 1990 to sign an agreement on conventional armed forces. This could be preceded by a meeting of foreign ministers.

I want to draw attention to our new position. I mean, the inclusion in the Vienna negotiations of all air planes of the front line (tactical) aviation, that is, bombers, fighter-bombers, ground attack aircraft, and front line fighters, and the establishment of a limit to them of 4,700 planes for each of the alliances. Moreover, we propose fixing a separate level for air defense fighter-interceptors.

The thrust of present-day European policy is not only the reduction of the huge mass of conventional weapons, which are a burden upon the economy, ecology, and social spheres of European life, but also the creation of a new system of relations characterized by trust and cooperation. That is why we are now introducing into the negotiating process the exchange of information on the numbers, structure, and disposition of troops and armaments throughout Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals, profound, all-penetrating verification [proverka], including on-site inspections, and stabilizing measures which would make any substantial movements and concentration of troops subject to monitoring [stavit' pod kontrol'].

We discussed President Bush's proposal on "open skies" for the first time at such a level, and expressed our positive attitude to it.

The realization of this idea could become part of a future global system of strengthening confidence and reducing the military threat. Presently, the U.S. initiative is formulated in the most general terms, and negotiations will be needed to define its content more specifically. The Soviet Union is ready to take part in a conference to discuss this issue.

In our view, we must work towards having "open seas and oceans" and an "open land" and "open space." Here glasnost cannot be selective and restricted; it must operate everywhere.

Regional problems. All regional situations, essentially, were reviewed. The exchange of opinions was constructive, aimed at seeking points of contact.

The topic of a **Central American settlement** occupied a prominent place in our talk with Mr J. Baker. Both sides expressed their support for the agreements of the presidents of Central American countries, and declared their readiness to render the necessary assistance in implementing them. We confirmed that the Soviet Union is refraining from supplying weapons to Nicaragua.

During the discussion of the **Afghan problem**, we raised as a point of principle the United States' observance of the Geneva accords, of which they are guarantors. It was agreed that the sides would expound their arguments in writing, and then would especially review the situation at a meeting of their representatives.

We also drew the attention of the U.S. side to the plan for an Afghan settlement put forward by President Najibullah at the conference of nonaligned countries in Belgrade. We emphasized that this plan shows a serious striving by the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan to seek ways out of the present situation.

In connection with our earlier appeal, the U.S. side informed us of the steps it has been taking to facilitate the release of Soviet servicemen in the hands of Afghan opposition formations.

Our **humanitarian cooperation** has long since ceased to be an area of one-way movement.

We informed the U.S. side about the preparation in our country of new laws—in particular, those on entry and exit and on freedom of conscience—which correspond with high international standards and the Vienna accords. The results of our discussion on this matter are reflected in the joint statement.

Much in present-day Soviet-U.S. relations can be characterized by the words "for the first time."

Thus, for the first time within the framework of consideration of **global** or **transnational issues**, accords have been achieved on the joint elaboration of specific proposals to expand cooperation in ecology, including with regard to preparations for the UN conference on the environment and development in 1992.

While making a number of our own proposals, we support certain new interesting ideas of the U.S. side, especially concerning an integrated approach to changes in the biosphere.

We spoke about utilizing the market, introducing economic methods for regulating the national economy, and the problems of regulating monetary circulation.

We found the secretary of state's account of the U.S. economy interesting.

The Soviet-U.S. intergovernmental documents signed today testify to the intensification of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue.

There is an agreement on reciprocal trips by residents of the Bering Strait area, an accord that is unique in its character and has considerable humanitarian potential.

There is also an agreement on a Bering Strait regional commission that is intended to facilitate the organization of regular cooperation between the border authorities and local bodies of the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug and the State of Alaska.

A joint USSR and U.S. statement has been signed on a unified interpretation of the norms of international law governing the peaceful passage of ships.

Thus, the number of valid intergovernmental agreements between the USSR and the United States in the realm of bilateral relations has increased to 39. This testifies to much.

One can claim quite definitely that my fifth meeting with Secretary of State Baker has been a success.

Here in Jackson Hole I recalled Earnest Hemingway's story, "Wyoming Wine." It's a very sad story about people divided by the lack of understanding. They meet, talk, hunt, fish, and do all this together, but each lives his own life and lacks the willingness or the ability to enter imaginatively into the life of someone else.

I think there's a serious lesson for politicians in that story. You can't do anything for your country or for other countries if you are unwilling or unable to understand one another.

In suggesting that we should hold our meeting in these parts, Mr Baker has made a splendid choice.

First, because the meeting has had a wonderful background. In its natural beauty and its state of preservation, Jackson Hole has presented us with an image of the world, already lost in many parts of the earth, which we have a duty to restore everywhere and preserve for the future. Second, we have been surrounded here by remarkably hospitable and friendly people, and their attitude to us has, as it were, removed the barriers that still divide us. Finally, all this has created an atmosphere conducive to frankness and has engendered a desire to overcome misunderstanding.

In this we have to a large extent succeeded. Now we understand each other better. Therefore, we can put into practice with a greater probability of success the formula "from mutual understanding to interaction."

That is the main result of the meeting near Grand Teton. Being constantly before our eyes, it has reminded us of the heights we have yet to scale. In these days we have taken several vigorous steps on the path toward them.

Cordial thanks to all those who have helped us in this.

E.A. Shevardnadze then answered questions from correspondents.

Question: Mr Minister, as I understand your proposal on the strategic offensive arms treaty and the ABM Treaty, the Soviet Union continues to insist on total adherence to the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972. This is considered to mean the narrow traditional interpretation of the treaty. But is this not the problem, and how do you intend to tackle it?

Answer: We intend to maintain that both we and the U.S. side should adhere to the ABM Treaty as it was signed in 1972. We have now adopted a very important decision which is of great significance for making practical headway at the talks on nuclear and space arms. I am referring to the fact that the treaty on a 50 percent reduction in strategic offensive arms will be signed, if it is drawn up, even if we do not manage to find a common language with the U.S. side on the ABM problem. But the ABM Treaty will have to be strictly observed all the same.

Question: You spoke about the new ideas and proposals contained in M.S. Gorbachev's letter to President G. Bush that might help resolve many tough problems. What was the U.S. side's reaction to these proposals?

Answer: You ought really to ask the Americans about that, but we get the impression that the administration is now very interested in our proposals. We were told that the ideas and proposals submitted by us are being given in-depth study. Overall, if I am not mistaken, the reaction was positive.

Question: Mr Minister, is there agreement with the U.S. side to draw up an understanding with regard to what, as far as tests go, is banned and what is permitted in space under the terms of the ABM Treaty?

Answer: We propose reaching agreement on what exactly can be done in space. Presently we agree that research and tests related to research can be carried out in space. However, this does not relate to antimissile defense components and systems, and to their space-based prototypes. The new idea, the new move which we advanced during these negotiations, consists of this. I think that these ideas will be given the appraisal they merit.

I repeat, one gains the impression that the U.S. side's reaction is on the whole positive. True, they say—as is natural—that everything must first be studied, and then the appropriate position can be formulated.

Question: You said that Europe needs a new stage of confidence. What role do the changes in Eastern Europe, in particular in Poland and Hungary, play here?

Answer: To judge from the statements by the leaders of Poland and Hungary, and the leaders of other states, I think we are at one in our attitude to those processes currently taking place in Europe, in particular the negotiations on reduction of conventional weapons, the problem of tactical nuclear weapons, and further measures to take to strengthen confidence. The states of Eastern Europe, including Poland and Hungary, are members of the Warsaw Pact, and, as their leaders point out, they intend to keep to that.

Question: We have been told here that the Soviet side[1] has agreed not to include in the strategic offensive arms treaty sea-based cruise missiles. On what conditions will you withdraw this category?

Answer: Our proposal consists of the fact that it is not necessary to include an agreement on sea-based cruise missiles in the text of a treaty on strategic offensive arms if that will assist its rapid conclusion. In this event, it might be possible to go for taking mutual commitments with respect to the quantitative limits of sea-based cruise missiles outside the text of a treaty, but in connection with a treaty.

Question: Is this agreement to envisage verification [kontrol']?

Answer: It is impossible to achieve a serious agreement without a system of verification [kontrol']. The observation of any agreement must be verified [kontrolirovat'].

Question: I would like to define more precisely your new position on linking strategic offensive arms treaties and ABM treaties. Can it be said that you, in general, have not withdrawn the strategic offensive arms and ABM linkage, but are just interpreting it somewhat differently?

Answer: We are saying that an ABM treaty must be strictly observed in the future, too. When a strategic offensive arms treaty is signed, and if any of the sides, hypothetically speaking, violate the ABM treaty, the other side retains the right to withdraw from the strategic offensive arms treaty which will be concluded.

Question: Do you think that the Bush administration could have done more for the success of perestroyka, or is perestroyka, as the administration says, a purely internal matter for the Soviet Union?

Answer: Perestroyka is our own vital concern. No one will work for us. We have our own plans, concept, reserves and potentialities. The plans for perestroyka and our program enjoy the support of all the people. Perestroyka will take place. There should be no doubts on this regard. We value, of course, the moral and political support of sober-minded figures, including in the United States. They support perestroyka because they are aware that implementation of the plans for perestroyka accords with the interests of the whole of present-day civilization. We are convinced of this, are acting in this spirit, and will continue to act so in the future.

TASS on Baker's Assessment of Wyoming Talks

LD2409221589 Moscow TASS in English 2201 GMT 24 Sep 89

[Text] Washington September 23 TASS—By TASS correspondent Aleksey Berezhkov. U.S. Secretary of State James Baker appeared on Sunday on a CBS television programme "Face the Nation" with a commentary on his talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze in Wyoming on September 22-23.

We made progress along the entire range of the arms control agenda, the secretary of state stated. We got out of a 15-year-old deadlock in the talks on nuclear tests. This is a major and very significant achievement, Baker said. The same goes for the chemical weapons.

According to the secretary of state, the parties achieved a truly fundamental progress on strategic offensive weapons.

Speaking about proposals advanced by the Soviet Union at the Wyoming meeting, Baker said that they contained many components. We must take them to Washington and analyze them, he noted.

We shall give the Soviet Union a detailed answer to these proposals at the Geneva talks that will resume on September 28, Baker promised.

'Text' of Baker's Statement on Talks

LD2409212389 Moscow TASS in English 1158 GMT 24 Sep 89

[Text] Washington September 24 TASS—Follows the text of the statement by James Baker, U.S. secretary of state, at Jackson Lake Lodge, Wyoming, on September 23:

"On behalf of all of us, I would like first to thank the people of Wyoming for letting us share this majestic location for a few days.

"The openness of this setting epitomizes the new nature of our talks with the Soviets. I believe U.S.-Soviet relations are entering a fresh phase. We've moved from confrontation, to dialogue and now to cooperation—joint action on common problems, across a broad range of topics on our five-part agenda.

"This has been a productive ministerial. In fact, Minister Shevardnadze told me today that in his view this ministerial was unique from the standpoint of content and context.

"Our flight to Wyoming, where we discussed the challenges of the nationalities problem and perestroyka, set a tone of openness for our subsequent meetings. We followed with U.S. proposals for open skies and open lands, a human rights work program to support the development of a more open Soviet society, our initiative for greater environmental cooperation including exchanges, and a new discussion of the economic changes taking place within the Soviet Union.

"We also took a series of steps across the full arms control agenda to overcome old misperceptions and build trust. In fact, Minister Shevardnadze told me we made more progress across the full range of arms control issues than in any prior ministerial he has attended.

"We've translated this new spirit of openness into some concrete achievements, too.

"First, the Soviets said they have dropped their linkage between completing and implementing agreement on START and achieving a defense and space accord. I made clear that the President remains committed to the Strategic Defense Initiative and offered the Soviets the opportunity to visit SDI research facilities.

"Second, the Soviets agreed to dismantle their radar at Krasnoyarsk without preconditions.

"Third, we broke a 15 year deadlock by agreeing on the full verification regime for the nuclear testing treaties. This provides a detailed framework for the possible completion of these treaties next year.

"Fourth, we signed a memorandum of understanding on a chemical weapons data exchange and verification tests, a good, realistic step toward addressing the larger task of completing an effectively verifiable ban on chemical weapons.

"Fifth, our willingness to lift the ban on mobile ICBMS, contingent on congressional approval of funding for the U.S. mobile ICBM programs, made it possible for us to move ahead on developing verification measures for mobile missiles.

"Sixth, based on President Bush's June proposals, we signed an umbrella agreement on START verification

and stability measures, as well as a separate agreement on notification of strategic forces exercises.

"Seventh, the Soviets agreed to President Bush's proposal to explore the details of an open skies regime at an international conference.

"Eighth, we explored new ideas about resolving a number of regional conflicts. In particular, I believe we share a view on the importance of free and fair elections in Nicaragua and on stopping support for subversion in El Salvador.

"We also both support efforts to promote a Palestinian-Israeli dialogue. And we condemn hostage-taking while supporting the immediate release of the hostages held in Lebanon.

"Ninth, we followed up on the encouraging efforts by the Soviets to permit refuseniks and others to emigrate freely. We've also developed a new human rights work program, placing increased emphasis on exchanges, that could promote the contentions that should protect human rights in the Soviet Union.

"All in all, we got a lot of work done. We want to keep on going. And we shall."

"In that connection, as you know by now, President Bush and President Gorbachev have agreed to hold a summit meeting in the late spring or early summer of next year. Minister Shevardnadze and I will, of course, be meeting in advance to try to make the summit as productive as possible.

"Before I close, let me make one final announcement. President Bush intends to offer a new initiative at the U.N. on Monday that will move the world closer to a ban on chemical weapons. The President believes United States leadership is necessary to turn good intentions into an historic achievement."

Shevardnadze-Baker 'Joint Statement'

PM250930Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
Second Edition 25 Sep 89 p 5

[TASS report: "Ministers' Joint Statement"]

[Text] E.A. Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and J. Baker, U.S. secretary of state, carried out negotiations on 22 and 23 September in Jackson Hole (state of Wyoming) to discuss the entire spectrum of Soviet-U.S. relations. This meeting took place during the official visit of the USSR foreign minister to the United States.

On 23 September E.A. Shevardnadze had a conversation with President G. Bush in the White House, during which he handed the U.S. president a message from M.S. Gorbachev, containing new ideas and proposals on security issues. A broad exchange of opinions took place regarding the general direction and prospects for development of relations between the two countries.

Both sides attach great importance to contacts between the highest leaders of the USSR and the United States for developing dialogue at this crucial and promising stage of Soviet-U.S. relations. By way of development of understandings between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush reached earlier, it was agreed that the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting will take place in the United States at the end of spring or the beginning of summer 1990.

Both sides agree that their common aim is to create more stable, constructive, and firm relations in which openness and interaction force out distrust and rivalry to an ever-increasing degree. Although there are still significant differences on certain issues, the foreign minister and the secretary of state are convinced that, by continuing to make the necessary efforts and share an adherence to frank dialogue directed at finding practical and concrete solutions, the sides will be able to accelerate and develop the progress achieved in recent years in Soviet-U.S. relations.

From the point of view of achieving this goal, the discussions in Jackson Hole were productive and serious. They were also supplemented by the efforts of working groups of experts on all areas of the agenda of the negotiations, consisting of five main points. The foreign minister and secretary of state concluded concrete accords on a number of areas and determined new directions of work.

1. The foreign minister and the secretary of state thoroughly and productively examined the whole range of weapons verification and disarmament issues. They noted with satisfaction that since their May meeting in Moscow, talks on nuclear and space weapons and nuclear tests, and bilateral consultations on chemical weapons, had resumed.

The foreign minister and the secretary of state held a detailed discussion on matters of the talks on nuclear and space weapons, including ideas contained in letters exchanged by M.S. Gorbachev and George Bush.

In relations to antimissile defense and space issues, the Soviet side proposed a new approach, directed at solving this important question. Both sides agreed that the Soviet approach opens the way to achieving and implementing a treaty on strategic offensive weapons without concluding an agreement on defense and space. The sides agreed to abandon the approach connected with an obligation not to withdraw [from the treaty], at the same time continuing the discussion of ways to ensure predictability in the development of the Soviet-U.S. strategic correlation on conditions of strategic stability, with the aim of reducing the risk of nuclear war. The U.S. side stated that it will study attentively other aspects of the Soviet approach in general. Both sides agreed that their participants in the talks will discuss these issues in Geneva. They also agreed that the participants in the talks will discuss the invitation by the U.S. side to Soviet Government experts to visit two U.S. facilities, at which strategic defense research is being conducted.

The Soviet side declared that, guided by its long-standing goal of strengthening the regime of the ABM treaty, it has decided to completely eliminate the Krasnoyarsk radar station. The U.S. side expressed satisfaction with this declaration.

However, the Soviet side also stressed anew the need to remove the concerns of the USSR over the U.S. radar stations in Greenland and Great Britain. The U.S. side promised to consider these concerns in consultations with its allies.

In the interest of promoting progress at the negotiations, the secretary of state announced that the U.S. side is withdrawing its proposal on a ban on mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles at the negotiations on strategic offensive weapons, depending on resolution by the U.S. Congress of the question of financing United States mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles. The Soviet side expressed satisfaction with this statement, and both sides agreed on the need for further work to be done on provisions relating to effective measures to verify [kontrol] the limitations on mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles. In this connection, they also reached an understanding on the issue of additional elements of common agreement on monitoring [kontrol] mobile intercontinental ballistic missiles, developing the elements agreed at the summit meeting in Moscow and during the subsequent work in Geneva.

Both sides noted the need to solve the problems of air-launched cruise missiles (ALCM) and sea-launched cruise missiles (SLCM). On ALCM's the Soviet side put forward a new idea concerning its approach to resolving the problem of ALCM's and heavy bombers.

On the issue of SLCM's, the Soviet side proposed new approaches to settle this complex problem. The Soviet side raised the question of possibly solving the SLCM problem in the wider context of naval armaments. As for nuclear and space weapons talks, the Soviet side called on the U.S. side to concentrate on verification [kontrol] and stated that in the context of a system for verifying [kontrol] SLCM's these weapons could be limited outside the framework of the text of a treaty on strategic offensive weapons on the basis of mutual obligations. While confirming its willingness to study the Soviet side's ideas, the U.S. side, in turn, stressed its doubts as to the possibility of an effective system to verify [kontrol] SLCM's, and also noted its long-standing view that serious problems arise in any discussion of limitations of naval armaments.

The Soviet side responded positively to President Bush's 1 June initiative on measures of verification [kontrol] and stability. In this context, the foreign minister and the secretary of state thoroughly exchanged opinions on the details of the initiative in question and signed an agreement aimed at working out such measures and containing principles for their implementation. They also drafted and signed an agreement on timely notification of major exercises by strategic forces. They examined other measures of verification [kontrol] and stability and agreed to study them further in Geneva.

The sides also agreed that in the context of a level of 1,600 delivery vehicles, ballistic missiles will be defined as a combination of missiles and associated launchers, thus enabling a long-standing problem to be resolved.

The negotiators will be given new instructions, which will take into account the exchange of views on these and other issues concerning the talks on nuclear and space weapons.

The foreign minister and the secretary of state reaffirmed their aim to achieve at the earliest opportunity a comprehensive, monitorable, and genuinely global ban on chemical weapons. In order to augment efforts toward that aim and to reinforce openness and trust between the two countries, they signed a memorandum of understanding concerning a bilateral experiment in monitoring [kontrol] and exchange of data. The memorandum envisages an exchange of data on Soviet and U.S. chemical weapons stocks as well as visits to and inspections of facilities connected with chemical weapons.

The sides adopted a special joint statement on chemical weapons, in which they underlined the need to achieve a ban on chemical weapons and expressed their concern over the problem associated with chemical weapons proliferation.

The foreign minister and secretary of state examined the state of affairs at the nuclear test talks. They noted that their delegations have agreed on an ad-referendum protocol on monitoring [kontrol] of the 1976 treaty on peaceful nuclear explosions, and have achieved an accord on including hydrodynamic and seismic monitoring methods as well as on-site inspections in the protocol on monitoring of the 1974 treaty on limiting nuclear weapons tests, as well as on the explosion yield levels above which these measurements will be taken. In order to obtain a statistically significant quantity of information for refining the two sides' national technical means, each side guarantees the other the right to conduct on-site hydrodynamic measurement of the explosion yields of at least two tests per year during the first 5 years after the treaty is ratified. After 5 years, each side guarantees one such hydrodynamic measurement per year unless the sides agree otherwise. These agreements provide a framework for the conclusion of protocols on verification [proverka], which will bring to an end the process that began 15 years ago. They have instructed their delegations to continue their intensive work to resolve all outstanding issues so that these two documents can be tabled for ratification as soon as possible.

The foreign minister and the secretary of state noted with approval the work done at the talks on conventional armed forces in Europe, and advocated the earliest conclusion of an agreement.

The foreign minister and the secretary of state agreed on principle with the "open sky" concept put forward by President Bush on May. This could make a real contribution to the cause of openness and trust-building. They noted their willingness to take part in an international conference on this subject.

The sides noted the importance of joint efforts by the USSR and the United States to prevent the proliferation of missiles and missile technology, and agreed to intensify bilateral consultations on this current problem.

II

The foreign minister and the secretary of state carried out a detailed and frank exchange of views on regional issues. The sides reaffirmed their viewpoint that active support by the USSR and the United States for comprehensive political solutions based on broad national reconciliation could make it easier to achieve the peaceful settlement of regional conflicts in the world. They noted that they are still at odds on certain aspects of arms deliveries and the way these affect the possibility of a political settlement.

It was noted that experts on regional problems have held a cycle of discussions on the sphere of regional problems, on Central America, Afghanistan, Africa, the Near and Far East, Southeast Asia and the Pacific region. Both sides thought these discussions had been useful from the point of view of understanding each other's opinions, and agreed that the meetings of experts will continue.

They expressed their support for the efforts of the Central American countries to establish a lasting peace in the region on the basis of the treaty signed in Esquipulas and of subsequent agreements, including the undertaking of not permitting the use of their territories for supporting those seeking to destabilize other Central American countries. After noting differences in their points of view on certain issues, including the problems of arms deliveries to the region, they called on all interested parties to actively support the peace process by fully respecting the letter and spirit of the accords signed by the leaders of the five Central American countries. They also called upon all states outside the region to respect the request of the Central American countries that all military and to irregular or rebel forces should cease.

The sides agreed that a political settlement is necessary in Afghanistan on the basis of national reconciliation, ensuring the status of Afghanistan as a peaceful, independent, and nonaligned state. While maintaining different approaches on how to realize these principles, they agreed that a transition period is required and is a necessary mechanism in the interests of creating a broad-based government. The sides confirmed their adherence to the Geneva agreements on Afghanistan.

The sides confirmed their support for the activization of the peace process in the Near East. They also exchanged opinions on the role of an Israeli-Palestinian dialogue in this process, leading to an all-embracing settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict in which all the interested parties must participate.

The foreign minister and secretary of state expressed in a separate joint statement firm support for the plan of the Arab League Tripartite Committee in relation to the announcement of a ceasefire in Lebanon, the lifting of the blockade, and a dialogue of the Lebanese sides aimed at achieving a political settlement. They condemned the practice of seizing hostages and advocated the immediate liberation of all hostages.

The foreign minister and the secretary of state called for an all-embracing political settlement in Cambodia and for the continuation of the negotiation process in the interests of reaching it. Presently, they consider it most important to make efforts to avert an intensification of the civil war and a return to power of the Pol Pot regime. The sides expressed their readiness to declare a moratorium together with other states on providing military aid to all the Cambodian sides as a component part of an all-embracing settlement.

The foreign minister and the secretary of state agreed on the necessity of realizing in full and on time the UN plan on granting independence to Namibia, including carrying out free and honest elections. They expressed their support for the process of national reconciliation in Angola and the efforts directed towards ensuring peace and stability in Mozambique. The sides also expressed themselves in favor of a political solution to the internal conflicts in Ethiopia and in support of the negotiation process which has begun between the Ethiopian Government and the Eritrean People's Liberation Front.

III

Within the framework of the dialogue proceeding between the USSR and the United States on human rights and humanitarian issues, the foreign minister and the secretary of state conducted a constructive discussion of a wide range of human rights and humanitarian issues, including the role of international agreements and universally recognized standards in the field of human rights, and also the Helsinki Final Act and other agreements such as the Conference on European Security and Cooperation.

Particular attention was devoted to policy and cases in the sphere of departure and entry [to and from countries], freedom of conscience and criminal-legal practice, in respect of which issues were raised by both sides and information will be exchanged. The foreign minister and the secretary of state agreed to promote a number of programs to facilitate a better understanding by the sides of the institutions, legislation, and practice in force in each of them concerning human rights and humanitarian issues.

US

The foreign minister and the secretary of state discussed a broad range of problems related to two other points on the agenda—bilateral and transnational issues. The ministers signed an intergovernmental agreement on mutual trips by inhabitants in the Bering Strait area and an agreement on a regional commission on the Bering Strait area.

A joint statement by the USSR and the United States was also signed on a common interpretation of the norms of international law regulating peaceful passage through territorial waters, which eliminates a potential source of friction in relations between the two countries. Approval was given to a working document entitled "Mutually Acceptable Conditions Governing Recognition of the Jurisdiction of the UN International Court." In furtherance of this, the sides agreed to propose discussing this matter with the other three permanent members of the UN Security Council.

It was acknowledged that Soviet and U.S. experts have recently drawn up an approach to settling the problem of delimiting sea areas in the Bering and Chukotka Seas and also in the Arctic and Pacific Oceans. The foreign minister and the secretary of state directed their experts to meet again in the near future to complete the work on this basis.

The sides agreed to start negotiations on a possible expansion of air communications between the USSR and the United States.

In addition to the agreement, virtually prepared already on cooperation on the peaceful use of atomic energy, it has been decided to speed up the working out of proposals to reach a new agreement on cooperation in power engineering.

Agreement was reached in principle that Soviet and U.S. cultural and information centers will be opened in Washington and Moscow respectively.

The USSR foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state approved a working program of actions in the sphere of bilateral relations.

The sides also discussed issues relating to implementing the memorandum on a mutual understanding and cooperating in the fight against the illegal trade in narcotics, which was signed in January 1989. They expressed readiness to discuss new ideas on bilateral and international cooperation in this sphere. It was stipulated that experts from the two sides would meet in Moscow by the end of 1989 to discuss specific proposals.

A detailed discussion took place on issues concerning the fight against international terrorism. Agreement was reached in principle on holding a new meeting of experts on this issue at the start of 1990.

The sides stressed the desirability of stepping up contacts between the leading functionaries and elected officials and specialists in various spheres.

Particular attention was given to matters of continuing and extending bilateral and international cooperation in the protection of the environment, including the problem of global changes in the environment and climate, and also the problem of the different sources of pollution.

The sides confirmed their intention to complete by the end of the current year work on an agreement on cooperation in world ocean research, and also to continue work on preparing an agreement on cooperation in housing and other types of construction.

The accord on holding consultations and on cooperation with the aim of raising the effectiveness of the United Nations was confirmed.

The foreign minister and the secretary of state noted the necessity of continuing the search for new spheres of cooperation, aimed at a qualitative advance in bilateral and transnational areas of Soviet-U.S. relations.

A thorough discussion of a whole range of economic questions took place, with the participation of experts. It was agreed to continue these mutually useful discussions.

The usefulness of holding regular meetings on the foreign minister level for the examination and resolution of major issues of Soviet-U.S. cooperation was confirmed by both sides.

Soviet-U.S. Statement on Chemical Weapons

PM2?Sep89 pp *Moscow PRAVDA in Russian Second Edition* 29 Sep 89 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Soviet-U.S. Joint Statement on Chemical Weapons"]

[Text] During the meeting which took place on 22-23 September 1989 in Jackson Hole, Wyoming, Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and Secretary of State J. Baker confirmed the determination of the USSR and the United States to work persistently for a ban on chemical weapons and for the destruction of all stockpiles of such weapons, on the basis of an all-embracing, effectively monitored [kontroliruyemyy] and genuinely global ban. The sides feel that one of the most pressing tasks of the international community is to conclude and put in force as rapidly as possible a convention on this matter. They consider that with the active and constructive participation of all states it will be possible to rapidly resolve the remaining issues and conclude a convention as soon as possible, and they call upon all sides in the negotiations to join them in achieving this goal.

The sides also consider that great openness between them, and also between other countries, can improve the prospects of reaching an agreement as soon as possible.

on an effective ban on chemical weapons. As concrete expression of the determination of both countries to achieve this goal, the foreign minister and the secretary of state signed a memorandum of understanding with regard to a bilateral experiment on monitoring [kontrol] and exchange of information. The steps agreed to in the memorandum are designed to facilitate the process of the negotiations and the signing and ratification of an all-embracing, effectively monitored [kontrol] and genuinely global convention on banning and destroying chemical weapons.

The experiment in monitoring [kontrol] and the exchange of information will be conducted in two stages. The first stage envisages the exchange of general information on the military-chemical potentials of the sides and a series of visits to corresponding military and civilian sites on their territories. At the second stage, the sides will exchange detailed information and will permit the conducting of on-site inspections to check the accuracy of the information given to each other.

The sides also agreed to cooperate on the issue of the destruction of chemical weapons. They agreed on mutual visits with the aim of observing the operations of the other side for the destruction of chemical weapons and the exchange of information on past, present and planned actions and procedures for destruction.

The sides noted the presence of agreement on certain procedures for conducting inspections on demand and on regulations determining the order of destruction of chemical weapons and of sites for the production of chemical weapons. These two approaches will be presented for multilateral negotiations at Geneva with the aim of aiding these negotiations. They also underlined the necessity of concentrating efforts in the near future on the solution of the outstanding issues with regard to verification [kontrol]. The sides intend to carry out intensive bilateral discussions on banning chemical weapons in order to facilitate the achievement of further progress in multilateral negotiations.

The foreign minister and the secretary of state expressed their profound concern over the mounting threat to international peace and security connected with the danger of the unlawful use of chemical weapons in conditions of the existence and creeping spread of such weapons. They reaffirmed the importance of the final declaration of the Paris conference on banning chemical weapons—held at the beginning of this year—their adherence to that declaration, and their adherence to the 1925 Geneva Protocol. The sides emphasized the commitment of all states not to use chemical weapons in violation of international law. They called for the international community to adopt quick and effective measures in the event this commitment is violated. In this respect, they noted their support for the UN secretary-general in investigating reports of violations of the Geneva protocol or other relevant norms of ordinary international law.

The sides welcomed the convening by Australia of a conference against chemical weapons with the participation of governmental and industry representatives, which has just concluded its work in Canberra. They noted that the conference created a fine opportunity for serious discussion between the representatives of government and industry from different countries of the world. The sides expressed their satisfaction with the great amount of productive work accomplished at the conference and with the positive results reflected in the conference chairman's final statement.

In conclusion, the sides expressed the opinion that a genuinely global, comprehensive, and effectively verified ban on chemical weapons is the best means, on a stable, long-term basis, of combatting the threat caused by the creeping spread of chemical weapons. Meanwhile, the sides emphasized their readiness to attempt to avert the dissemination of chemical weapons. They intend to continue their consultations on this matter. round-ups

Soviet-U.S. Statement on Lebanon

PM270900 TASS Moscow PRAVDA in Russian Second Edition 25 Sep 89 p1

[Unattributed report: "Soviet-U.S. Statement on Lebanon"]

[Text] Voicing deep concern over the lack of peace and continuing conflict in Lebanon, the Soviet Union and the United States once again make a persistent call for all possible measures to be taken to put an end to the Lebanese people's sufferings and to persistently continue the search for a political solution to the crisis. They reaffirmed their conviction that the problems of that country did not have a military solution. The only sensible way leading to national accord is an constructive dialogue between the Lebanese, who themselves should achieve lasting agreements on the peaceful settlement in Lebanon on the basis of the balance of interests.

The USSR and USA welcome the resumption of the peace mission of the Arab League committee on Lebanon under a mandate from the pan-Arabic conference in Casablanca and the committee's efforts aimed at a ceasefire, at lifting the blockade and starting the process of political settlement. They urge all sides involved in Lebanon to give a positive response to these proposals and render maximum assistance to the efforts of the committee to ensure the success of its work. They also stress the importance of rendering firm international support to the committee and, on their part, intend to take further efforts in this direction.

Both sides reaffirm their firm position in favour of preserving the sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of the Lebanese state.

The USSR and USA condemn any acts of hostage-taking and demand the release of hostages, irrespective of where and who took them.

Jackson Hole, Wyoming, United States
23 September 1989

Political Analyst Assesses Wyoming Talks

LD2409161089 Moscow TASS in English 1541 GMT 24 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 24 TASS—By TASS political analyst Yuriy Kornilov:

What will world problems look like viewed by Moscow and Washington from a Wyoming mountain summit?

This was the question splashed over the front pages of the international press in the past few days.

The answer is now clear—the Soviet-American talks were held from beginning to end in a constructive and business-like atmosphere, were hall-marked by a high degree of mutual understanding and have undoubtedly made notable progress in creating a more stable relationship between the two great powers.

The range of Wyoming dialogue was quite enormous. But although the importance and the pressing nature of every item on the agenda was undeniable, it would be quite correct to say that the major practical problems of concern for the negotiators at the meeting were specific matters of strengthening security and, above all, the reduction of strategic offensive weapons.

The two parties have amassed mountain ranges of these devastating arms—with the Soviet Union possessing nearly 2,500 strategic carrier-rockets with some 10,000 warheads mounted on them, and the United States disposing of over 2,000 carrier-rockets with about 14,000 warheads.

The reduction of these arsenals is an extremely intricate task, but a new approach provided by the Soviet Union for resolving the issue has thrown the doors open toward the conclusion and implementation of a treaty on strategic offensive weapons. There is no need to stress that the world will sigh with relief at the news of the most powerful nuclear arsenals being cut to half their size.

Summing up the results of talks in Wyoming—substantive progress was made there also on other matters, too, apart from the strategic offensive weapons—some newspapers indulge in speculations as to who pressed whom the stronger and which side gave in more.

We think this angle is misleading in assessing the event. True, there were mutual concessions, as the WASHINGTON POST justly notes in its issue of 24 September.

Both sides compromised on an extensive range of issues. Which is as it should be, for concessions are normal in business talks. But the main thing is that the talks in Wyoming have made it clear once again that even the most intricate issues can be resolved, given the adequate political will of the parties.

The first successes on the path toward a breakthrough in Soviet-U.S. relationships, as all may know, were attained within the period when the Reagan team was at the helm in Washington.

The past eight months were, for Moscow as much as for Washington, a period of mutual adaptation. The results of talks in Wyoming filled with practical meaning the statement to the effect that the intent of both parties were not only to acknowledge the good done in the past but to strive for new, greater achievements.

This does not mean, of course, that all disputes have been settled and all issues resolved. It is impossible to ignore what the NEW YORK TIMES, while highly appraising the outcome of the Wyoming talks on the whole, found it necessary to recall—there are conservative quarters in the United States who are hardly likely to welcome the perspective of reducing strategic offensive weapons.

The fact is there, but notwithstanding, Wyoming has been put on the political map anew, not only as the venue of a regular meeting of politicians of the two great powers but also the place where another practical step was made toward a non-nuclear world and the strengthening of U.S.-Soviet cooperation.

Commentary on Shevardnadze-Baker Talks

LD2509175089 Moscow World Service in English 1230 GMT 25 Sep 89

[Text] Our analyst Aleksandr Pugachev comments on the results of the meeting between the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state:

The participants had every reason to evaluate positively the outcome of the talks. President Bush, who also received the Soviet minister, expressed his satisfaction over the meeting. It has been agreed that Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush are to meet around late spring-early summer next year. But a summit meeting should be held only if the sides are convinced that they can reach major agreements. The talks between Shevardnadze and Baker have done much to foster such a conviction.

Prior to their talks, officials of both countries and press reviews had noted deep differences in approach towards disarmament, particularly in the field of strategic weapons. But further events proved that progress there was quite possible. I won't go into details now, writes Aleksandr Pugachev, but just refer to the overall conclusions made by the negotiating parties that certain mutual compromise proposals are promising real success in preparing and signing a treaty on halving strategic arms. Mutual concessions have permitted to take out of an impasse a problem that has been wanting to be solved for 15 years—that problem is ratification of the Soviet-American treaties on limiting underground tests of nuclear arms and also underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. Optimism is encouraged by the sides' positions drawing closer on banning chemical

weapons and eliminating their stockpiles. That progress has given grounds for a conviction that the remaining questions can be speedily settled and a convention concluded in the nearest future.

Much could be said about the discussion of regional conflicts. A high degree of understanding was reached in some cases, which can be seen from the joint Soviet-American statement on Lebanon, aimed at a political solution to the crisis. Certain differences remain on the approach towards the Afghan problem, but even on that it was agreed to discuss the situation further at a meeting of Soviet and American representatives.

I won't go into details of several agreements bearing on the Soviet-American bilateral relations, writes Aleksandr Pugachev. What I can tell you is that their number has reached 39, a sign of progress in itself. And in conclusion, a quote from Eduard Shevardnadze during the final press conference: We have come to understand each other better and can now more successfully proceed from mutual understanding to interaction.

Shevardnadze Arrives in New York for UN Session

LD2509011089 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2100 GMT 24 Sep 89

[Text] New York, 25 Sep (TASS)—E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, arrived in New York on Sunday to take part in the work of the 44th session of the UN General Assembly. He is heading the USSR delegation at the General Assembly session.

Senator Urges Bush To Lift Trade Barriers

LD2509155389 Moscow TASS in English 1115 GMT 25 Sep 89

[Text] Washington September 25 TASS—George Mitchell, leader of the U.S. Senate Democratic majority, has urged President Bush to lift obstacles to trade between the Soviet Union and the United States. In an ABC interview on Sunday he said that the President should suspend the Jackson-Vanik amendment. This discriminatory amendment, adopted in the seventies, links bilateral trade, including the granting of most favoured nation status to the USSR, to the Soviet Union's emigration policy.

Speaking of reforms in the USSR, Mitchell pointed out that their success would promote international stability. The senator noted the importance of the integration of the reformed Soviet economy into the world system. He said that economic contacts usually contributed to the consolidation of international relations in general.

Northeast Asia

Foreign Ministry Statement on Japanese Relations

LD2709161089 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1445 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 27 Sep (TASS)—The Soviet Union would sincerely like an improvement in relations with Japan and is doing all in its power to attain this. It is obvious, however, that for an improvement in relations efforts are required on both sides, based on a well-rounded consideration of realities and an attentive and well-considered approach to questions affecting the interests of one's partner, says a statement by a USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman published here today in connection with a statement passed by the Japanese cabinet on 19 September calling on citizens of the country not to travel to the southern Kurile Islands until the problem of the "northern territories"—as the southern part of the Kurile chain, which belongs to the Soviet Union, is called in Japan—is resolved, as the statement puts it.

As for the claims contained in the document of the Japanese cabinet of ministers about the USSR "illegally occupying" the southern part of the Kurile Islands and about talks going on between the USSR and Japan on "returning the northern territories," the USSR Foreign Ministry notes that—as the Soviet side has already made clear on frequent occasions—Soviet ownership of all the Kurile Islands, including the southern part of them, was determined by the outcome of World War II and has indisputable historical and legal foundations. Second, there neither have been nor are there any such talks between the two countries. There is, however, one issue between them that is in need of a solution: the issue of concluding a peace treaty. It is on this problem and by no means on any other that Soviet-Japanese talks are under way.

The statement by the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman points out that while deciding to virtually prohibit trips by Japanese citizens to the southern Kurile Islands on Soviet entry visas, the Japanese side is at the same time raising the matter of expanding visits there by Japanese people on a visa-free basis, particularly in connection with the existing Soviet-Japanese accord on the procedures for mutual trips by the citizens of the two countries to their relatives' graves. The thought suggests itself that the Japanese side is attempting to exploit an accord of a particularly humane nature for political purposes, the document states.

On the whole, the Soviet foreign policy department regards the Japanese side's behaviour as yet another move within the context of fanning the campaign of set-rumbled territorial claims against the USSR, which "can do nothing at all to help strengthen trust and improve Soviet-Japanese relations."

West Europe

UK Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher Visits

Thatcher Welcomed by Primakov

LD2309164289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0700 GMT 23 Sep 89

[From the "120 Minutes" program; report by correspondent Leonid Bin]

[Text] Today British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher stopped over in Moscow en route from Tokyo to London. [Video shows RAF aircraft coming to a halt on tarmac. Thatcher descends steps and is presented with a bunch of red roses by Primakov.]

At Vnukovo Airport she was welcomed by Comrade Primakov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Soviet of the Union of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and by other officials. Today there will be a working meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Margaret Thatcher. It is anticipated that during the conversation the leaders of the two countries will touch upon questions pertaining to East-West relations, disarmament matters, European and regional security, and general European construction. The British prime minister will hold a press conference on the outcome of the meeting planned for this afternoon.

Talks With Gorbachev Begin

LD2309092289 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 0825 GMT 23 Sep 89

[By Chris Moncrieff, PRESS ASSOCIATION chief political correspondent, in Moscow]

[Text] Mr Mikhail Gorbachev joked about the prime minister's jet-lag when the two leaders met in the splendour of the so-called "Hall of One Thousand Candles" in the Kremlin today to start their critical arms control talks. They met beneath the gilded chandeliers of the sumptuous Catherine Hall—named after Catherine the Great—in a bid to intensify the growing rapport between East and West over the crusade to scale down nuclear and conventional weapons worldwide.

A smiling Mrs Thatcher, looking fit and sprightly despite the gruelling 12-hour flight from Tokyo completed only hours before, strode briskly into the hall through the ornate east door. She was wearing a smart close-fitting emerald green two-piece suit with black accessories.

At the same moment, smiling as broadly as ever, Mr Gorbachev emerged from the west door. They met in the middle and shook hands warmly. Then, they sat down at a long walnut table facing each other with advisers and interpreters on either side of them.

Mr Gorbachev, as he assembled his papers, grinned and said: "Prime Minister, I expect you are feeling very jet-lagged."

She replied: "It is not too bad now, thank you very much, since we are back in European time. That makes a big difference."

Mr Gorbachev replied: "I am glad to hear that but Kissinger used to wonder where Europe ended."

The small-talk continued for a few moments before the clutch of television cameramen and reporters were ushered from the room.

Moscow is three hours ahead of London compared with Tokyo which is eight hours ahead.

It was in the same hall that the two leaders met in the spring of 1987.

Their meeting today showed no lessening of the personal warmth and chemistry that plainly exists between them.

The two leaders last met on April in London immediately after Mrs Thatcher returned from her five-nation Africa tour. Soon after that visit, Britain expelled eight Soviet diplomats and three journalists for spying. The Kremlin hit back and expelled the same number in a tit-for-tat move which plunged relations between the two countries to a new low.

As a result of that Mrs Thatcher was expecting a slightly chilly "atmosphere" on their talks today but there was no sign of that when the three-hour discussions began.

The hall in which they met boasts 11 sumptuous chandeliers each bearing some 100 candles—now, of course, electrified. The ceiling is gilded and the gleaming floor is made out of many of the various types of timber natural to the Soviet Union.

Once again Mrs Thatcher used Professor Richard Pollock of Bradford University as her interpreter. Unlike the Soviet translators, who are accurate but wooden, Professor Pollock's translations are lively and carry on as Mrs Thatcher is actually speaking.

Thatcher-Gorbachev Talks End

LD2309212789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1154 GMT 23 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 23 Sep (TASS)—The talks between Mikhail Gorbachev and Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Great Britain, which began this morning, in the Grand Kremlin Palace, have come to an end. They were the main feature of the Soviet-British working summit. The contacts are now continuing during a working lunch, arranged in Mrs Thatcher's honor on behalf of Mikhail Gorbachev and Raisa Gorbacheva.

Arms Control, Reform Covered

LD2109125589 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1212 GMT 21 Sep 89

[By Chris Moncrieff, Press Association chief political correspondent, in Moscow]

[Text] Mr Gorbachev and Mrs Thatcher had "flashes of passion" on their talks at the Kremlin today, according to British sources. Arms control and internal reforms in the Soviet Union dominated the two and half hour meeting in the gilded splendour of the Catherine Hall, where the two leaders previously met more than two years ago. The talks were conducted on a friendly manner, with determination on both sides, elements of hunter and flashes of passion, the sources said.

Mr Gorbachev spent the first hour outlining to the prime minister the progress made in "perestroyka" in his country. Mrs Thatcher, for her part, stressed her strong support for what Mr Gorbachev is trying to do. Witnesses to the talks said Mr Gorbachev was in good form, relaxed yet vigorous, and clearly very determined to carry through his policy of internal reforms.

Most of the second half of the discussion was taken up with arms control. Sources said Mrs Thatcher left the talks with a clear understanding that the process of reaching agreement on scaling down nuclear and conventional weapons was well under way.

The question of human rights was also raised. The prime minister paid what was described as "due tribute" to the progress made on this area in the Soviet Union. However, she continued to press Mr Gorbachev on the plight of the refuseniks.

The issue of Poland and its new Solidarity-led government was also raised, but the outcome of that discussion was not clear.

Today's Kremlin talks were the two leaders' sixth major meeting. Afterwards, the prime minister left for lunch at the Soviet ministry of foreign affairs' guest house at the invitation of Mr Gorbachev. The Soviet leader's wife Raisa was also expected to be there, along with a clutch of Soviet ministers.

Gorbachev Notes Role of Perestroyka

LD2109120689 Moscow TASS in English 1150 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 21 TASS—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher had another meeting in the Kremlin today, which effectively continued their dialogue dating back from almost five years ago.

They agreed that the very fact of such a straightforward, honest, informal and in-depth exchange of opinions between representatives of very different states and social systems marks a fundamentally new stage in international relations.

Any upheavals and complications which may arise in relations between the two countries recede before the overriding significance of such dialogue.

It is especially important now that the world is going through very cardinal changes. The present generation of the leaders of states, especially such as the USSR and Britain, do not have the moral right to miss the chance to jointly ensure a peaceful period in the history of civilization.

Getting together again after less than six months, Gorbachev and Thatcher were able to note the continued improvement of the international atmosphere: tension is lifting, trust is getting stronger and there are more possibilities to solve a number of major problems.

Gorbachev appreciated Thatcher's close interest in Soviet developments and her knowledge of how perestroyka has been faring. In turn, her judgements attested to her understanding of the tremendous international significance of reforms in the Soviet Union.

Mikhail Gorbachev's analysis of the progress of economic and political reforms was accompanied by a lively discussion of ways to effect them within a socialist framework, through righting deformities linked to Stalin's policies and abolishing the administer-by-command system, dogmatic thinking and the underestimation of the experience of other nations.

The focus was on the main aspects of the reforms—democratization and decentralization, which will lead to the desired goal only given the integrating role of the new mechanisms of power and administration and the party's new role.

The discussion also concerned the causes behind the special difficulties of the current transitional period and the plans and methods of tackling pressing problems, which are the most worrying to Soviet people.

Responding to various opinions about the present phase in perestroyka, including those coming from the West, Gorbachev took stock, for example, with claims that there is no point in advancing on many fronts at the same time.

How can the economy be reformed without reforming the political system? Nothing will come of it, as already borne out by some sad experience.

How can both the economy and politics be reformed without democratization in society and without glasnost which make people closely involved in public and political affairs?

How can healthy interethnic relations be forecast and shaped in isolation from economic, political and general democratic changes throughout society?

How can perestroyka as a whole be effected without updating the party?

But consistency, a step-by-step approach, balance the absorption of experience, scientific validity, new thinking and accord between all sections and ethnic groups making up Soviet society are required in everything.

The nature and very theme of the discussion is a fundamentally new development in East-West relations, manifesting a desire to correctly understand the intentions and policies of everyone in the common interests of the world community.

The two leaders exchanged information about new developments in Soviet-American contacts on disarmament. They had a substantive discussion of problems of reducing conventional arms and armed forces ahead of the forthcoming resumption of the Vienna talks.

Naturally enough, the issue of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe was not ignored either.

Disagreements remain. But the detailed and candid discussion of contentious issues demonstrated that it is quite feasible to attain very serious agreements in the foreseeable future.

In the context of the CSCE [Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe] process, Gorbachev and Thatcher reaffirmed that neither the USSR nor Britain has the slightest intention to act to the detriment of the security of either of them and that a policy allowing a departure from this principle in relations between any states is dangerous and hopeless.

But the CSCE process depends not only on the lowering of military confrontation and on the disarmament components of security. Its future is linked also to respect for freedom of choice, ruling out encroachments upon the sovereignty of other states under any pretext.

Gorbachev and Thatcher also discussed some pressing issues in bilateral economic relations.

Details on Talks Given

LD2709164089 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Margaret Thatcher, the British prime minister, held their latest meeting in the Kremlin today. It was actually a continuation of a regular dialogue that has been conducted for almost 5 years. The colloquators stated that the very fact of such a direct, honest, informal, and in-depth exchange of views between the representatives of such different states and social systems marks the emergence of international relations at a completely new stage. Any reversals or aggravations that might arise in relations between the two countries recede in the face of the principled significance of such dialogue. It is particularly important when such cardinal changes are occurring in the world. The present generation of state leaders, especially such states as the Soviet Union and Britain, do not have the moral right not to utilize the chance to greatly shape a peaceful period in the history of mankind.

Meeting again after less than 6 months, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Margaret Thatcher have been able to note an improvement in the international atmosphere. Tension is disappearing and trust is being strengthened. One breathes more easily. There are more opportunities for tackling a number of major problems.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev appreciated the keen attention of Margaret Thatcher to the processes occurring in the USSR and her knowledge of the progress of perestroyka. In turn her opinion shows an understanding of the tremendous international importance of Soviet society.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's analysis of the progress of economic and political reform was accompanied by a lively discussion on ways of implementing it within the framework of socialist choice and by overcoming the deformations connected with Stalin's policies, the administrative command system, dogmatism in thought, and a lack of appreciation of the experience of other peoples.

There was discussion of the key areas of reform, democratization, and decentralization, which will achieve their aim only given the integrating role of the new mechanisms of power and administration, and the new role of the party. Also under discussion were the causes of special difficulties during the current period of transition, and plans and methods for resolving the vital problems which are now of great concern to Soviet people.

A characteristic theme of such discussion is the manifestation of a fundamentally new approach to East-West relations, and a desire to correctly understand the intentions and policy of each in the general interests of the world community.

The colloquators exchanged information regarding new elements of Soviet-U.S. contacts on disarmament issues. They discussed in detail the problems of reducing conventional arms and armed forces on the eve of the Vienna talks. Naturally, the question of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe was not overlooked. Disagreements remain, but the detailed and frank analysis of disputed matters showed that the achievement of very serious agreements is entirely possible in the foreseeable future.

In the context of the general European process, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Margaret Thatcher once again reaffirmed that neither the USSR nor Great Britain has the slightest intention of acting in a way that could damage each other's security. They agreed that a policy allowing any deviation from that principle in relations between any states would be dangerous and hopeless.

But the European process depends not only upon lowering military confrontation and upon the disarmament

components of security. Its destiny is also linked with respect for freedom of choice, which excludes the infringement of the sovereignty of other states under whatever pretext.

Several current issues of bilateral economic contacts were examined.

The full text of the communique is published in the press.

More on Content of Talks

PM251000Z89 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Sep 89 Second Edition pp 1,2

[TASS report: "Meeting Between M.S. Gorbachev and M. Thatcher"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev and M. Thatcher, prime minister of Britain, held their latest meeting in the Kremlin 23 September. In fact this was a continuation of the regular dialogue which has been going on for almost 5 years now.

The interlocutors stated that the very fact of such a direct and honest, informal, and in-depth exchange of opinions between the representatives of such different states and social systems shows that international relations have entered a completely new stage. Any reversals or aggravations which may occur in relations between the two countries pale before the fundamental significance of this dialogue. It is particularly important when such cardinal changes are taking place in the world. The present generation of state leaders, particularly of states such as the USSR and Britain, does not have the moral right not to take advantage of the opportunity to justly fashion a period of peace in the history of civilization.

Meeting again after less than 6 months, M.S. Gorbachev and M. Thatcher were able to note a further improvement in the international atmosphere. Tension is disappearing and trust is strengthening. People can breathe more freely. There are more opportunities for the solution of a number of major problems.

M.S. Gorbachev appreciated Margaret Thatcher's keen interest in the processes taking place in the USSR and her knowledge of the course of perestroyka. Her opinions in turn demonstrate an understanding of the tremendous international significance of the transformations in Soviet society.

M.S. Gorbachev's analysis of the progress of the economic and political reforms was accompanied by a lively discussion on ways to implement them within the framework of a socialist choice and by overcoming the deformations connected with Stalin's policy, the administrative-edict system, dogmatic thinking, and the failure to appreciate other peoples' experience. There was also a discussion of the key directions of the transformations—democratization and decentralization—which will achieve their goal only given the integrating role of the new mechanisms of power and management and the new role of the party. There was also a discussion of the reasons for the special difficulties of the current transitional period and the plans and methods for resolving the urgent problems which alarm Soviet people most of all now.

Responding to the assessments of the present stage of perestroyka also emanating from the West, M.S. Gorbachev drew attention in particular to the groundlessness of the theses which asks: Why act on so many fronts at once? But how can you reform the economy without reforming the political system? It will not work. Sorry experience already exists on that score. How can you reform the economy and politics without the democratization of society and glasnost, which involve mass active social and political life? How can you predict and shape healthy international relations in isolation from economic, political, and general democratic transformations throughout society? How can you implement perestroyka in general without renewing the party?

But in all this there must be consistency, step-by-step progress, a considered approach, the assimilation of the experience gained, scientific validation, new thinking, and accord among all the strata and peoples forming Soviet society.

The character and very theme of such a discussion are a manifestation of a fundamental innovation in East-West relations and a desire to correctly understand each other's intentions and policy in the general interests of the world community.

The interlocutors exchanged information on new aspects in Soviet-U.S. contacts on disarmament questions. There was also a detailed discussion of the problems of the reduction of conventional arms and armed forces on the eve of the resumption of the Vienna talks. Naturally, the question of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe was not overlooked, either.

Disagreements remain. But the detailed and frank examination of contentious issues showed that the achievement of very substantial accords is perfectly possible in the foreseeable future.

In the context of the all-European process, M.S. Gorbachev and M. Thatcher reaffirmed that neither the USSR nor Britain has the least intention of doing anything to harm the other's security and that a policy which permits a deviation from that principle in relations between any states is dangerous and futile. However, the European process depends not only on the lowering of military confrontation and on the disarmament components of security. Its fate is also bound up with respect for freedom of choice, which precludes encroachment on the sovereignty of other states on any pretext.

Some topical questions of bilateral economic ties were examined.

Gorbachev Host Working Lunch

LD2309164089 Moscow TASS in English 1636 GMT 23 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 23 TASS—A working lunch for British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher was given today by Mikhail Gorbachev and Raisa Gorbachev within the framework of the Soviet-British working summit meeting.

Alternate Member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Council of the Union Yevgeniy Primakov, Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Leonid Abalkin, Soviet Ambassador to Britain Leonid Zamyatin, other officials, and also persons who accompany Margaret Thatcher, as well as British Ambassador to the USSR Rodric Braithwaite were present, among others, at the luncheon.

Primakov Sees Off Thatcher

LD2309221189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 23 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Tonight British Prime Minister Thatcher left Moscow for London. She was seen off at the airport by Comrade Primakov and other officials.

Thatcher Holds News Conference After Talks

TASS Report: News Conference

LD2309141789 Moscow TASS in English 1402 GMT 23 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 23 TASS—British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher described her meeting with Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev today as "another milestone in the continuing series of discussions we've had since 1984."

She told a news conference here: "During that period enormous changes have taken place in the Soviet Union, leading to greater political liberty and the prospect of real prosperity for ordinary people, as well as much better relations between East and West."

"All in all, I am greatly encouraged," added Thatcher.

She was speaking after 2.5-hour talks with Gorbachev this morning and a further 1.5 hours of discussions after lunch with the Soviet leader.

Gorbachev, she said, "is in very good form" and "we covered a great deal of ground."

The Soviet president briefed the British prime minister on progress in political reform in the USSR, the state of the economy and interethnic relations, and the legislative package to be put before the Supreme Soviet when it meets again next week.

"I once again expressed my very strong support for the historic changes which are taking place in the Soviet Union," Thatcher commented.

The two leaders, she said, also had a detailed discussion of arms control, including talks towards reducing conventional armed forces and armaments and the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons.

The British prime minister said they agreed that a treaty scaling down conventional armed forces and armaments in Europe could be ready before the end of next year. She said the Soviet Union and Britain agreed on many practical aspects of this problem.

Thatcher also noted encouraging prospects for a convention on chemical weapons.

She said that in addition, the talks covered bilateral relations, including trade.

Thatcher on Disarmament Prospects

LD2309191489 Moscow TASS in English 1812 GMT 23 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 23 TASS—New Soviet conventional arms proposals promote progress in areas of previous disagreement, British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher told reporters here today, commenting on the results of her summit with President Gorbachev.

There are good prospects for a conventional arms agreement by the end of next year, she said.

Speaking about strategic offensive arms cuts, the prime minister said that talks on nuclear and space weapons between the Soviet Union and the United States in Geneva were of primary importance for NATO countries who are under an American "nuclear umbrella."

Talks on nuclear and space arms are steadily moving toward an agreement, she said drawing attention to technical difficulties the negotiating sides are facing.

As compared to the INF talks, the nuclear and space arms negotiations focus on much more diverse and complex weapons which require very complex verification, she said.

The concept of nuclear deterrence still remains NATO's main strategy, Thatcher said.

Thatcher Opposes Entry in IMF, GATT

LD2309194189 Moscow TASS in English 1821 GMT 23 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 23 TASS—"I believe perestroyka is now set on its course and will go through to success," British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher told reporters here today, commenting on the results of her summit with President Gorbachev.

"Glasnost, the political reform I think has gone far further, far faster than any of us could ever have thought," the prime minister said.

As for the economic reform, it will bear fruit when the people respond in partnership with the government, she said.

"The prospects for great prosperity for the people of the Soviet Union are greater than they have been at any time during the last 70 years," she said.

"We strongly support perestroyka. It is a bold, courageous, visionary idea. One that of itself is very good both for the people of the Soviet Union and for all mankind. And it also as I've indicated brings the prospects of economic success and prosperity," Thatcher said.

The prime minister said she regretted that trade and economic contacts between Britain and the Soviet Union were developing not as fast as both sides want them to.

Despite the fact that several new and major contracts have been signed and a number of joint ventures launched recently, both countries should act more vigorously on this front, she said.

Thatcher said she opposes the admission of the Soviet Union into the International Monetary Fund and the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) explaining that the Soviet Union shall first make its economy more open.

Commenting on problems in bilateral relations, including the expulsion of several Soviet officials from Britain in May, Thatcher said that this issue was not discussed at her summit with Gorbachev.

Thatcher said she hopes the Soviet Union and Britain will find ways of solving this problem in the near future.

Thatcher 'Greatly Encouraged'

LD2309151289 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1456 GMT 23 Sep 89

[By Chris Moncrieff, PRESS ASSOCIATION chief political correspondent]

[Excerpt] A buoyant Mrs Thatcher today emerged from four hours of talks with President Gorbachev declaring herself "greatly encouraged."

She said she was impressed by the progress of reforms in the Soviet Union and the work towards reaching an agreement on arms control. It was "another milestone" in the continuing series of discussions between the two leaders since 1984, she told a press conference in Moscow.

She again praised Mr Gorbachev for his "bold, courageous and visionary" attempts at internal reforms in Russia. But she warned: "You won't wake up one day to find that perestroyka has suddenly happened. You have to work for it. There is no such thing as effortless prosperity."

Mrs Thatcher, whose talks began on the spicredeur of the Kremlin and continued at lunch in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, told 200 journalists she had been in touch with President Bush before the meeting began.

British sources said the talks were conducted with "flashes of passion" on both sides. They said both Mr Gorbachev and Mrs Thatcher were relaxed in each other's company.

Mrs Thatcher said there were encouraging prospects for agreements on conventional and chemical weapons.

She told the press conference: "Mr Gorbachev is in very good form. We covered a great deal of ground. "He brought me up to date on the progress of political reforms and economic reforms.

"He also told me about the very full legislative programme which lies ahead for the Supreme Soviet."

The prospect that the prime minister might herself address the Supreme Soviet was not raised during the talks.

Mrs Thatcher said there was "considerable discussion in depth" on arms control during the Kremlin session.

"We are at one in wanting a conventional forces agreement and we found a lot of common ground on the practical aspects."

The prime minister said Mr Gorbachev had given her an assurance that legislation was being drawn up to help people who wanted to leave the Soviet Union. "He told me there should be no practical difficulties."

Mrs Thatcher said enormous changes had taken place in the Soviet Union. "The prospects of real prosperity for ordinary people as well as much better relations between East and West now exist.

"All in all, I am greatly encouraged."

The prime minister refused to go into details on the arms control talks. All she would say was: "New Soviet proposals have taken matters further forward.

"The prospects of getting a conventional forces agreement before the end of next year are good."

She said: "The political reform has gone far further, far faster than any of us could ever have thought. They have transformed the whole atmosphere."

She said the reforms required "a great deal of boldness, courage and vision, all of which were forthcoming from Mr Gorbachev.

"The prospects of prosperity for the people of the Soviet Union are now greater than at any time for the last 70 years," she said.

"The old system would not have brought prosperity for the Soviet people. The new system will."

Mrs. Thatcher said a period of change always posed problems and dangers but added: "I am quite convinced that the atmosphere here has greatly changed since glasnost commenced.

"It is a historic mission on which the Soviet Union has embarked and it will have tremendous benefit for the world as a whole."

The prime minister showed no signs of fatigue after her grueling 11-hour flight from Tokyo to Moscow. [passage omitted]

Thatcher Says Perestroyka 'Visionary'

LD2309191189 Moscow TASS in English 1758 GMT 23 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 23 TASS—By TASS staff writers Mark Smith and Aleksandr Dedinaev.

Exuding optimism for perestroyka despite the problems it confronts, British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher swept in and out of Moscow on Saturday.

Speaking to journalists after her meetings with President Gorbachev and a "very cheerful, agreeable and delicious lunch," which was also attended by Raisa Gorbachev, Mrs. Thatcher stressed the importance of Soviet reforms for the whole of mankind.

"It is a bold, courageous, visionary idea, one that will bring greater liberty to the people of the Soviet Union—which it is already doing. That in itself is very good for the people of the Soviet Union and for all mankind.

"I think it is a historic mission on which the Soviet Union has embarked. I think it will also have other tremendous benefits for the world as a whole," she told a packed conference hall at the Soviet Foreign Ministry Information Center.

"Glasnost, the political reform I think has gone far further, far faster than any of us could ever have thought," she said.

Mrs. Thatcher expressed her firm confidence that perestroyka would succeed, although at the same time stressing that political reform is easier for governments to bring about than economic reform.

"But I am convinced that it will come about and the prospects for great prosperity for the people of the Soviet Union are greater than they have been at any time during the last 70 years," she added.

Mrs. Thatcher, looking calm and collected despite her hectic week and flanked by British Ambassador to the USSR Sir Rodric Braithwaite and Press Secretary Bernard Ingham, handled questions from the assembled reporters with her characteristic flair, occasionally delighting her questioners with the humour of her replies.

When asked about the potential role of Soviet women in perestroyka, she said, perhaps not wholly tongue-in-cheek, that "no country can succeed without women."

Commenting on Western newspapers at another point in the news conference, she quipped that "they are very informative and some of them, if not informative, have other characteristics," prompting much laughter among the correspondents present.

Clearly upbeat throughout the press conference, Mrs. Thatcher acknowledged the difficulties the political and economic reforms in the Soviet Union were facing. However, she made this direct plea to the Soviet people:

"You must never allow yourself to be overcome by the difficulties, when the scope for opportunity is so infinitely greater. The scope for changing the Soviet Union's prosperity and its relationship to the rest of the world to a more peaceful one is an enormous prize.

"Do not let some obstacles on the way stop you from going steadily and surely towards that prize."

Thatcher Supports Perestroyka

PM2509081189 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Sep 89 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Support for Perestroyka Course: Mrs Thatcher's News Conference in Moscow"]

[Text] British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, who is making a short stopover in our country en route from Japan, held a press conference at the USSR Foreign Ministry press center in Moscow yesterday.

Mrs Thatcher expressed satisfaction with her conversations with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. During their conversation they discussed key international problems and the state of bilateral relations. This was yet another milestone in the series of meetings with M.S. Gorbachev held since 1984, Mrs Thatcher said. During this time enormous changes have taken place in the Soviet Union, in her opinion. They have led to expansion of political freedoms and the emergence of real prospects for the achievement of genuine prosperity for the Soviet people, and the establishment of good relations between East and West. Mrs Thatcher again stressed that she supports the perestroyka policy.

It is a very bold policy, she said, which is in the interests of not just the Soviet people but the peoples of all countries. It is a historic mission which increases the chances of building lasting peace. Answering journalists' questions, in particular the British prime minister raised as good the prospects for concluding an agreement on

conventional arms in Europe by the end of next year, noting that the Soviet proposals help this.

Speaking about Soviet-British trade and economic ties, Mrs Thatcher expressed regret that matters are not progressing as quickly as desirable in this sphere. Contracts are being concluded and joint ventures set up, she said, but more energetic action is certainly necessary if dynamic progress is to be made.

PRAVDA on Praise of Perestroyka

PM250000 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Sep 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under general heading "Stay in Moscow"]

[Text] On the same day [23 September] M. Thatcher spoke at a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists. Describing the current meeting as another milestone in the series of discussions with M.S. Gorbachev which have been held since 1984, she noted that during this period enormous changes have taken place in the Soviet Union and progress in establishing better East-West relations has been achieved.

I expressed support for the historic changes which are being implemented in the USSR under M.S. Gorbachev's leadership, the British prime minister said further. Glasnost and political reforms have transformed the entire situation and atmosphere in the country, and I am confident that the success in political reforms will be followed by success in economic reforms, too. However, prosperity can be achieved only as a result of vigorous efforts on the part of the people themselves on the basis of partnership with the government. Perestroyka and the new thinking have opened up broad opportunities in this sphere which must be utilized. And when difficulties arise, which is inevitable in any major venture, it is important not to retreat, not to give up, and not to be afraid to pay a certain price for the sake of great goals. She emphasized that the West firmly supports the processes of renewal in the USSR because they are important for the whole world.

M. Thatcher dwelt on the content of the talks which took place in the course of the Soviet-British working summit.

While replying to questions about the talks on nuclear and space arms, she said in part that specific technical factors rather than a lack of will are hampering the talks. M. Thatcher declared that nuclear deterrence represents a vitally important strategy for NATO. "My stance on this score is unshakable," the prime minister added.

Touching on trade and economic cooperation between Great Britain and the USSR, the prime minister noted that "progress is not as rapid as we would wish," and expressed herself in favor of more vigorous steps in this sphere.

Thatcher Interviewed After Moscow News Conference

LD2309161589 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 23 Sep 89

[Interview with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher by Vsevolod Shishkovskiy following her Moscow news conference on 23 September—recorded]

[Text] [Shishkovskiy] Mrs Thatcher, we have met several times in London at 10 Downing Street, and now we are meeting here in my country. how do you feel yourself here in Moscow? The Soviet people are very interested to know your comments on the talks you had today with Mr Gorbachev.

[Thatcher] I am very pleased to be in Moscow, lucky to be on such a lovely day. As you know, the British ambassadorial residence is opposite the Kremlin, and the sun shines on the Kremlin and it looks absolutely beautiful. We have had very good talks with President Gorbachev. He is in extremely good form, strong, bold, vigorous, determined to carry through this great historic mission to its great conclusion. We talked about the latest position with regard to perestroyka and about the plenum which he has just held and his hopes for the future.

We talked also about the prospects for disarmament and a few bilateral things as well. They were very good talks, as they always are. I have great confidence in what Mr Gorbachev is doing, in his vision, in his courage, and in his boldness, and in the leadership that he is offering, and also in his capacity with international affairs of which he is extremely skilled, greatly to the benefit of the Soviet Union.

[Shishkovskiy] There is a feeling in the world that the process of disarmament has become slower, do you share such an anxiety and are there some encouraging signs of improvement of the situation?

[Thatcher] No I don't think it's got slower. Indeed, I think during the coming year or 1990 you will find a number of things at which you have been working hard coming to fruition. That will be good. I think you may get a START agreement, that's on the strategic nuclear weapons between the Soviet Union and the United States. It's very very complicated, that's why it's taking a time. I think you'll almost certainly get an agreement substantially to reduce conventional weapons in the Soviet Union down to agreed ceilings. That will be very welcome, they are working on that in Vienna. (And) there are one or two problems which Mr Shevardnadze and Mr Baker are now working on in the United States. We are both in touch with them, and I think the prospects there are good for an agreement next year.

The chemical weapons agreement (but) which we have been trying to achieve a breakthrough for quite a long time, that's going on in Geneva, again the signs are much more hopeful. So I expect you'll see quite considerable steps forward during 1990, but those steps forward will

come about because of the preliminary work we have been doing, and it has been done thoroughly so that those agreements when they are made will stick, and that's the important thing.

[Shishkovskiy] Many experts explain the slowness of international processes by the fact that some Western leaders prefer to wait for the final results of the developments in the Soviet Union. Would you agree with this?

[Thatcher] No, I would not. I think everyone knows that the Soviet Union has embarked upon a new course because the old course didn't and couldn't bring the prosperity to the people which they both want and hope will come. And so, you embarked on a new course. That course is continuous. I think almost everyone in the West, or everyone I know in the West (?would) firmly support this, is firmly behind Mr Gorbachev in his great endeavors. I think you might be a little bit concerned, because naturally in newspapers day by day they tend to concentrate on the difficulties—I mean the things which are constructive and good aren't news, and so, if you're not careful you get things out of perspective, they don't report the constant and steady improvements. And improvement there are; there is a new atmosphere in the Soviet Union and in Moscow, so please don't be put off by those reports, just keep your eye on the distant prospect.

[Shishkovskiy] How do you see the current and future relationship between Britain and the Soviet Union?

[Thatcher] Very good indeed. Ever since Mr Gorbachev—before he was secretary general—came to Britain, and we started to talk about matters, I thought that there was a possible, a basis for the future, a much more optimistic basis for the future, and it has come about and spread to the wider world. So, I think that we shall steadily go ahead. Internationally, I think that the prospects, as I indicated, for more disarmament agreements are good and the number of bilateral visits that go on, and greater contacts between people, there are far more people traveling, and contacts between people are extremely important.

[Shishkovskiy] What would you like to say the Soviet people before departure?

[Thatcher] Let met say this. The old system that you had for 70 years produced neither personal liberty nor personal prosperity. It couldn't, and so things are now being changed. First comes glasnost, and that has enabled so much freedom of expression and of speech, so much lively discussion, so much cross examination of those in power who are accountable to the people. It has done great things already. It shall be followed by economic reform. That requires not only the activities of politicians, it requires the willing and active cooperation of all the people. Economic results are a partnership between government and people and require the effort of each and every one, and I am sure that will be forthcoming. On the way to these much better prospects you will find many difficulties, many obstacles. If you set out to achieve some great endeavor, there are always problems. I hope you'll not be overcome by them, but will overcome the problems and always look towards the prospects for the future, because those prospects of greater prosperity for people within the Soviet Union are within your grasp. And we wish you all well and congratulate you on the great glasnost that has already been achieved and look forward to the Soviet Union becoming as well as a great military power, a great international power, a great and economic power.

Gorbachev, France's PCF Leader Marchais Meet

PM2909143189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Sep 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Meeting Between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Marchais"]

[Text] On 22 September in the CPSU Central Committee M.S. Gorbachev met with Georges Marchais, French Communist Party general secretary. The meeting's importance was reflected by the responsibility of the moment and the scale of the problems which were the center of attention: perestroyka as a "revolution within a revolution" in such a country as the Soviet Union. This determined the political and theoretical content of the exchange of opinions.

M.S. Gorbachev gave a thorough description of the processes occurring in our country. The originality of perestroyka consists of the fact that it is not destroying the foundations created by our first great revolution. The process of dialectical denial and renaissance of everything valuable in the enormous potential inherited from October is taking place. We are sorting out and liberating ourselves from everything which is connected with the deformations of socialism, which bound the free activity of man who believed in and accepted the socialist ideal. The adherence to it of all classes and strata and all the peoples of the Soviet Union is the basic characteristic of perestroyka.

This does not mean mindless optimism and carelessness regarding the worry and alarm of the people over the way perestroyka is proceeding. The time is such that special responsibility has been placed on Communists for the destiny of socialism not only before their own people but also before civilization as a whole.

We are open, said M.S. Gorbachev, to a perception of the achievements of other social systems. But this is to more fully reveal the potential of socialism and to prove its necessity and indispensability in the general progress of mankind. We do this through establishing and developing democracy, through raising the role of man as the main protagonist in the economy, politics, and the spiritual sphere, that is as it should be in a socialist society.

The complications and conflicts and the acuteness of the present situation are explained not only by their objective inevitability in the changeover period. There are

also errors in economic, political and ideological activity. Much could have been prevented if the party and the country's leaders had more quickly mastered new methods, new functions, and their new role. Delay in this forms vacuums into which elements alien to perestroyka—both of the command-administration persuasion and those who deny the socialist essence of perestroyka—rush. This is why the question of renewal in the party itself is so topical. The problem of the party is now at the center of attention of the entire society.

In this connection we decided to bring forward the date of the congress. Preparation for it will allow us to come to the congress with great ideas both of programmatic significance and also on matters of the statutory bases of party activity. The CPSU activity in the coming period and the development of the whole of society will happen in a situation of complicated political struggle.

On behalf of the French Communists, the French Communist Party general secretary declared his firm and resolute support for the policy of revolutionary restructuring. We are speaking about a gigantic event of world significance, he stressed. The French Communist Party, struggling as it is for a socialism of "French colors" that takes account of the country's specific peculiarities, has an interest in restructuring's success, for it signifies "socialism's second youth."

Right from the start, French Communists welcomed restructuring, he recalled. Naturally, it was as events developed in the USSR that they became aware of the full profundity of the transformations. Also important for them is an objective assessment of the Soviet people's achievements on the socialist road. This confirms the correctness of the choice made in Russia in 1917 and in France in 1920, when the French Communist Party was formed.

G. Marchais remarked that it advocates the broadest possible alliance of the country's left-wing democratic forces, and plays an indispensable role in defending the working people's interests.

The interlocutors were united in believing that it is imperative to conform to strict realism in assessing the situation within their countries and in international development. They were also uniform in their assessment of the Communist Party's role in the struggle for socialism, in denying dogmatism and various sorts of universal schemes, and in the style of mass party work, under the specific conditions of either country.

M.S. Gorbachev and G. Marchais noted the importance of the theoretical, including joint, work of Communists for an interpretation of the past and the present and for lessons to be drawn from the varied experience of revolutions, the workers' movement and socialist society.

The long-term absence of the atmosphere needed for such an open and creative exchange of opinions by communist parties has damaged both the socialist countries, the communist parties of other countries, and the entire communist movement. There is much that could have been foreseen and avoided, had the communist parties been up to the mark in this respect.

By way of self-criticism, M.S. Gorbachev said, the CPSU should also take upon itself the responsibility for everything being judged from the "single model" position. Any searching was taken as "revisionism" and "a deviation from principles." The present atmosphere in relations between communist parties is evidence of the fact that the communist movement is gaining a new wind and shows its ability to develop.

The socialist idea is finding its path in the most varied conditions and in countries with the most varied level of development. There are things common for all, however, and they are that socialism is a society where people themselves must rebuild their lives, or, in Lenin's words, socialism is the living creation of the masses. Therefore, it is to be achieved only by democratization in all spheres of life. The understanding of this idea of the classics of Marxism has a meaning which unites all Communists and now, more than at any other time.

A wide exchange of opinions took place on the content of common human values. Misunderstandings which have arisen in certain parties regarding the new thinking are connected, evidently, with underestimating the fundamental changes that have taken place in the development of civilization. In the contemporary world these values determine the main imperatives of world politics. If they are ignored, global problems may bury all systems and all ideologies.

G. Marchais also drew attention to the fact that common human values include justice and freedom. M.S. Gorbachev supported this idea, saying it is even more important that socialism proclaimed its adherence to these values and considered them priority values. In this way it is acquiring a new appearance, connecting itself with disarmament, renouncing the politics of strength, the democratization of international relations, human rights, defense of the environment, national independence, and overcoming world poverty. All this should be thoroughly thought through to its conclusion, both through science and through interparty discussions by Communists.

The conversation was full of mutual information on the situation in the Soviet Union and France. The processes in the economy, culture, social relations, and the situation of various classes and strata of society were discussed in detail. Problems of unemployment, youth, and such sicknesses of the century as drug addiction and crime were discussed.

A significant place was occupied by the problems of international relations, primarily Soviet-French ones, but also Soviet-American ones, the issues of the pan-European process and integration, and the settlement of regional conflicts.

In all this a complete unity of views and understanding of the fact that civilization is ripe for switching to a peaceful period in its development was discovered.

The subject of the relations between socialist countries was also discussed. We are realizing common objectives, said M.S. Gorbachev, but are acting under different conditions, and, consequently, we have different policies. This is natural, for everything must be understood in the context of the actual situation, or else we would again return to schemes divorced from life. We accept criticism from our friends. We do not intend to criticize anyone regarding assessments of our experience, our perestroyka. World socialism cannot develop from now on in accordance with one scheme or at one speed; this contradicts Marxism and the laws of dialectics.

Concern may arise due to some situations or other in a friendly country. When this happens the most important thing is to strive to understand each other, to take into consideration the circumstances in which one or another fraternal party defines its policies.

The principles of relations between socialist countries, as between communist parties, have been clearly defined once and for all: complete and utter independence [polnaya samostoyatelnost i polnaya nezavisimost], noninterference, a comradely exchange of opinions, regular contacts, trust towards each other, and solidarity. The question of possible forms of versatile contacts between the parties was touched upon.

The thorough talks, comprehensive in theme, and taking place in an atmosphere of trust, frankness, and openness were highly appraised by the participants. M.S. Gorbachev and G. Marchais stressed with particular satisfaction the coincidence of their views on fundamental questions of the essence of socialism and of peaceful development, and the role of the communist movement.

M.S. Gorbachev asked for the friendly greetings of the CPSU leadership and Soviet Communists to be conveyed to the French Communists and the French Communist Party Central Committee. He asked that they be told of the feelings of sympathy and gratitude for their solidarity with the CPSU activity in the revolutionary renewal of society.

G. Marchais conveyed greetings from French Communists and stressed that both their support for perestroyka and the coincidence of views were founded on general principles and on the understanding of the significance of socialism for the whole of mankind.

Participating in the conversation were A.N. Yakovlev and M. Gremetz, as well as K.N. Brutents, V.S. Gusenkov, Yu.I. Zayev, A.S. Chernyayev, A. Bocquet, and Zh.-F. Gio [names as published].

Leaders Discuss Perestroyka

LD2709074089 Moscow TASS *in English* 0551 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 27 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev met French Communist Party leader Georges Marchais at the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee today.

In his detailed analysis of Soviet perestroyka, Gorbachev said its distinctive feature lies in the fact that it does not destroy the groundwork laid down by this country's first great revolution in October 1917.

He described perestroyka as a process of dialectic negation and revival of everything valuable in the vast potential inherited from that revolution.

"We are open to taking on the achievements of other social systems—but only in order to bring out the potentialities of socialism more fully and prove it to be essential and indispensable to the overall progress of humanity," Gorbachev said.

On behalf of French Communists, Marchais declared solid, unwavering backing for revolutionary perestroyka. The French Communist Party working for a socialism of "French colours" which will take account of the country's peculiarities, is interested in perestroyka's success, he said.

Gorbachev and Marchais stressed the importance of theoretical, including joint, work by Communists to understand the past and present and draw lessons from the diverse experience of revolutions, the working-class movement and socialist society.

The fact that an atmosphere needed for such a frank and creative exchange of opinions between communist parties was lacking for a long time, has harmed both socialist countries and the communist parties of other countries, it has harmed the entire communist movement. By way of self-criticism, the Soviet Communist Party, Gorbachev said, should assume its share of responsibility for everything having been judged from the standpoint of a "single model" and for any quest having been perceived as "revisionism" and "a departure from principles". The present atmosphere in relations between communist parties attests to the fact that the communist movement is gaining a second breath and to its capacity for self-development.

A broad exchange of opinions on the context of common human values took place. It was noted that the misunderstanding in some parties concerning new thinking is apparently connected with the underestimation of radical changes that took place in the development of the civilization.

These values determine the main imperatives of world politics today.

Marchais noted that common human values comprise justice and freedom.

So it is ever more important that socialism proclaimed its adherence to these values and realizes their primacy, Gorbachev said.

Socialism thus assumes a new look, becoming associated with disarmament, renunciation of power politics, democratization of international relations, human rights, environmental protection, national independence, the effort to eliminate poverty in the world.

Much attention was given to problems of international relations, above all Soviet-French relations, and also of Soviet-American relations, questions of the European process and integration, settlement of regional conflicts.

Complete identity of views and the awareness that the civilization is ripe for a transition to a peaceful period of its development has been manifested.

The theme of relations between socialist countries cropped up. The principles of relations between socialist countries, just as between communist parties have been determined clearly and for ever. They are complete independence, absolutely no interference, comrades' exchange of opinions, regular contacts, confidence in each other, solidarity.

Gorbachev, Marchais Praise Party Ties

LD2709194789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev today met with Georges Marchais, general secretary of the French Communist Party, at the CPSU Central Committee.

Prior to the start of the meeting comrades Gorbachev and Marchais replied to French journalists' questions about relations between the two countries' communist parties.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified speaker in French] How are relations between the French party...

[Gorbachev—interrupting] They have always been, I believe, even when some problems arose, nevertheless during the decades, they have been very good, very good. And this nature of the relations made it possible to discuss even controversial questions [interpr. corrects]. When speaking of recent times I think that Georges [Marchais] will agree—his and my colleagues—that now these relations are of a sincere and open nature. Our meetings are always marked by an atmosphere of party comradeship. I won't say that we have similar or close [positions]; we are essentially united. [applause] But each time I meet with Comrade Marchais I feel the need, and so does he—this is what I sense—to spend 3, 4, or 5 hours talking and clarifying a few things. Everything is all right.

[Unidentified speaker in Russian] Thank you.

[Marchais, in French with superimposed Russian translation] Our relations resemble the weather prevailing in Moscow. Indeed, in the past there have been difficult moments in the relations between the CPSU and the French Communist Party. But I must say that since 1985 our relations have been excellent, excellent.

Naturally, regarding a number of problems we hold certain views, we argue, but we have excellent relations. But as far as perestroyka is concerned we agree entirely. [end recording]

Latin America & Caribbean

Shevardnadze To Visit Nicaragua in Early October

PM2709094789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "On E.A. Shevardnadze's Forthcoming Visit to Nicaragua"]

[Text] By agreement E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, will pay a working visit to Nicaragua in early October this year.

Supreme Soviet Session

Second Session of Supreme Soviet 'Crucial'

LD2509035189 Moscow TASS in English 0501 GMT 25 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 25 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent

The second session of the new Soviet Parliament, elected at the Congress of People's Deputies early in summer this year, began its work at 10 o'clock in the Kremlin today.

The forthcoming session will be extremely crucial and intensive, people's deputies believe. The importance of decisions to be adopted is determined by the acuteness of problems facing the country and the pressing character of many complex tasks that must be resolved.

During the two-month session the deputies are to examine a large package of draft laws and other documents directed at deepening political and economic reforms and harmonizing ethnic relations.

As announced at the recent meeting of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, the session will consider the draft plan and budget for 1990.

These emergency bills are designed to stop the worsening of the economic situation and secure first steps towards improving the country's financial situation and defusing social tension.

Journalists believe that the unconventional character of the drafts, both with regard to methods of elaboration and the scope of objectives, is sure to generate stormy and heated debates.

The people's deputies are to discuss a package of major draft economic laws, including the laws on property, land and land tenure, leasing and lease relations, and a uniform tax system.

Draft laws on transition of several republics to economic sovereignty and the order of settling collective labour disputes will also be on the focus of attention.

Documents designed to ensure efficient work of the parliamentarians themselves will also be discussed. These are the draft rules of procedure of the Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the draft statute of people's deputies.

Finally, the parliament's autumn session should become a preparatory stage for the second Congress of People's Deputies, tentatively slated for next December.

The bills will be thoroughly studied at parliamentary committees and commissions, with three days a week assigned for this work.

The two houses, the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities, will hold joint or separate sittings on Mondays and Tuesdays.

This is the tentative programme of work of the second session of the Soviet Parliament. The deputies will finally formulate the agenda today.

Supreme Soviet Begins Second Session 25 Sep

LD2509071089 Moscow TASS in English 0709 GMT 25 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 25 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent

The second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, elected at the first Congress of People's Deputies last summer, began in the Kremlin today.

The sitting was opened by President Mikhail Gorbachev.

The agenda of the bicameral Soviet parliament's session includes the discussion of the draft plan and budget for 1990 and the adoption of draft laws of immense importance for implementing economic and political reforms and perfecting ethnic relations.

The session is expected to work for two months.

Gorbachev Delivers Supreme Soviet Opening Speech

LD2509102189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 25 Sep 89

[Speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, at USSR Supreme Soviet session on 25 September in the Kremlin—recorded]

[Text] Comrades' Four hundred and seventy deputies have been registered. It is a long time since we heard that figure. We can work.

Esteemed comrades, on opening the present session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, first of all I greet you. And I want to make a number of remarks. First of all, we must approach our work of the fall session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the context of the real situation in society and the country. I don't think there is any need for me to give now a detailed description of the situation in society. Not only because, in the first place, you are well aware of it, but also because of these last few days, including literally the eve of the opening of the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, I have already had occasion to speak of this—and more than once.

I think it is correct to say today that the assessments of the situation in the country which the Supreme Soviet gave at the final stage of the work of the first session retain their force. Moreover, we can note that the situation has, in a number of cases, even become more complicated.

On the eve of the resumption of the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet, there was active discussion of the

question of the special features of the role and purpose of the fall session. And that theme has been in the forefront of discussions among the USSR Supreme Soviet people's deputies themselves, the members of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and in the press and society. And if I leave to one side the extreme judgments on this score, in which there is too little content and a great deal of harshness—and even simply a disrespectful attitude toward the Supreme Soviet, I have to remark that in society great—and in a number of cases exceedingly great—importance is attached to the work of the present session. People are expecting significant results from it, answers to many vital questions, and the adoption of major decisions that were discussed in the concluding stage of the spring session. These expectations are well-founded; they proceed from the situation of which I have spoken and of which you are aware, the situation in which our society finds itself and which requires immediate measures both to remove social tension and to resolutely advance perestroyka in all areas, and first and foremost where the socio-economic sphere is concerned.

As I see it—and this was, indeed, the unanimous view of all the members of the presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which has discussed matters pertaining to the forthcoming...[corrects himself] the present situation—the agenda submitted gives us the opportunity to get down straight away to working out those very measures that society is expecting. Neither the set of issues on the agenda nor their order is coincidental; both before and during the meeting of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet this was all thoroughly discussed. This will be mentioned in greater detail by Comrade Luk'yanov as he gives the reasons behind the various formulations on the agenda.

I would like to draw your attention to the following. The one aspect of the work of the present Supreme Soviet session I want to single out is the debate, working out and adoption of the 1990 socio-economic development plan. It may seem to some that this is a pretty ordinary matter that the supreme bodies of power have always dealt with every year, but even if that's the case it's a highly essential and serious business, since it concerns the life of our society, the life of our country. And even more so in the present specific situation, when we have to tackle many problems, including some that simply cannot be put off, the working out of the plan seems to me a matter of extraordinary importance.

We cannot shift this responsible work onto others. One way or another, positively or negatively—and that could also be—we have to make decisions, having considered the whole range of issues which are worrying society. The framework of discussion of the draft plan for socio-economic development for next year makes that possible. Any decision has to be well-argued, considered and responsible. It must be clear to Soviet people why this or precisely how we, the Supreme Soviet and the government, deal with one issue or another.

Within the framework of the plan we should first of all draw up measures to normalize the situation in the consumer market, and this presupposes the implementation of a range of measures to increase the goods on the market and, simultaneously, a range of measures to prevent an unjustified increase in monetary incomes. The line toward reinforcing our economy's orientation toward problems on the social plane should be continued in the 1990 plan. Next year is also the time for major decisions to be adopted, directed toward making our economy financially healthier. In drawing up and adopting these decisions, these difficult decisions, we must demonstrate convincingly to our people why they are essential, and what could await us should these decisions not be adopted. We must demonstrate what these decisions will yield, and what consequences there will be in the very near future.

And the last thing, which is of no small importance. The Supreme Soviet must firmly determine its position and adopt decisions on the work of transportation, on attitudes to strikes, on establishing order in trade and in the work of cooperatives, and on preparations for winter. All these are issues which are most directly desired, and they must be first and foremost at the center of our work in the committees and commissions and in the chambers and as a whole during the session of the Supreme Soviet.

The government, interacting with the republics and the commissions and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet, could urgently prepare and present proposals on all these issues.

The need for decisive progress in economic and political reform and to weaken tension in relations between the nationalities calls for examination first and foremost of the proposals which have been prepared on this score. What I have in mind is the draft laws on property and on land which are directly related to the reform, on leasing and on leasehold relation, the tax system, and so on—the point at which we concluded the work of the spring session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, as well as proposals for constitutional changes taking into account the holding of elections to republican and local soviets and adopting laws on several issues concerning the nationalities sphere.

If we bear in mind the whole list of issues proposed on the agenda then one can see that we have a huge amount of work awaiting us, a huge volume of work.

It is quite obvious that this assumes that the current session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will be different in character from the first: a high level of organization, of efficiency and rational use of working time. Let's work together in that direction. One can say with great confidence that society, too, expects precisely approaches such as these to resolving the issues on the agenda.

I would like, comrades, to dwell on another matter, too. We all feel the acute necessity of tightening up discipline and strengthening state and public orders in the country. At the end of the first session of the USSR Supreme

Soviet we virtually unanimously adopted a decision on the fight against crime. Work on this basis is getting under way, and it is already starting to yield the first fruits—insignificant ones as yet, of course—but one cannot fail to see that, although the law enforcement organs have started acting more boldly and vigorously, and the public has started to give them better backing, all in all it is too early to speak of a break-through as yet, and crime is still continuing to increase.

What is particularly worrying is that the normal functioning of enterprises and institutions, labor and everyday living conditions, people's moral and even their personal safety are not infrequently threatened, as a result of public disorders connected with inter-ethnic conflicts and attempts to get certain demands—albeit even unjustified demands—met by means of use of force and all kinds of ultimatums. There is no need to say that this is an extremely undesirable and dangerous phenomenon which substantially hampers the development of perestroyka process and I must say, one to which the whole of society is reacting very negatively. I was able to ascertain this, once again, when talking 2 or 3 days ago to worker and peasant members of the CPSU Central Committee.

It is important that it should be fully understood in our society that intolerance and resort to force is not the way to resolve problems. Such a method can only, on the contrary, put off solution of any issue for an indefinite time, and make it more difficult. Under the conditions of a democratic and law-governed state, to which we aspire and toward which we are making new steps, there cannot and must not be any other means of political action than reliance upon the law and striving to resolve all questions first and foremost by means of reaching agreement.

That is why, aside from the creation of new laws, the actual consolidation of legality is now acquiring more and more significance. No law—not even the best—will be worth anything if it just remains on paper, if the state cannot ensure that it is rigorously implemented, if the citizens do not conscientiously carry it out. The Supreme Soviet, the USSR government, the organs of power in the republics and locally, and those who have been charged by our Constitution with ensuring the implementation of the laws that are passed must pay attention to this side of the case.

I shall speak in particular about what is now the subject of the greatest concern—the situation in Armenia and Azerbaijan over the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh. I spoke about the extremely tense situation that has developed there in my recent report to the Central Committee plenum. In spite of the steps being taken, it has not proved possible in the past few days to fully unravel this tight knot. From the point of view of sorting out what has been going on on the railways. Only last night did trains start running in all directions and with all their loads, and more was transported then than during the daytime. As Comrade Vorotnikov reports for the government, and as is reported by other comrades who represent USSR departments there and who are tackling things along with the republican bodies, it seems something is taking shape, there is a change for the better.

If that is not merely an isolated incident but a trend, then I would not put forward the proposal that I was intending to speak about today. But I think that nevertheless, we ought to say that this region cannot be left in such a state. And if things do not stabilize, then I believe our government, together with the republican bodies, must introduce specific measures—exhaustive measures—to the USSR Supreme Soviet to unravel this knot. And, therefore, I believe we should see what happens in a day or two. And let the government be ready to report on its proposals, should the need arise.

I shall stress once again, comrades, that we can handle the tasks that face this session only if we work to our utmost capacity and are conscious of our responsibility for the results of our work—results which are awaited with impatience throughout the country. If it is to be expressed in a word, then perhaps our slogan for this fall session of the Supreme Soviet could be "efficiency, efficiency." This is precisely what is necessary now, when the country is expecting specific and effective solutions from the supreme organs of power. All of us, comrades, all of us need to subordinate our positions to this and to nothing else. I think that if there began to be heard speeches, appeals, and proposals here which do not correspond to that situation and those expectations which the people have of us, then in society there will be great disappointment in the Supreme Soviet and the government and all government organs.

Allow me, comrade deputies, to express the conviction that by working amicably and responsibly, we will be able to solve those less than simple problems now facing the country and ensure the conditions for further development of the process of perestroyka and the renewal of Soviet society.

I declare the sitting of the session—or rather I have already declared, so I confirm the declaration on the opening of the session of the Supreme Soviet and on behalf of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet in accordance with the agenda, I give the floor to Comrade Lukyanov.

Lukyanov Notes Supreme Soviet Procedures

LD2709104089 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] Deputy Lukyanov said the USSR Supreme Soviet session is planned to last about 2 months. Two plenary sessions a week are proposed, and three for the work of the commissions and committees of the parliament. Comrade Lukyanov said 19 matters of the first importance are being submitted to the session for discussion and to all 34 [However, the deputies have prepared more than 60 draft laws and other documents. Deputies then made comments and suggestions relating to the

agenda. The agenda was approved, taking account of the amendments and elaborations [otochenie] which had been adopted.

TASS Reports Agenda for Supreme Soviet

LD2509081589 Moscow TASS in English 0816 GMT 25 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 25 TASS—The second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet opened here today with a joint meeting of its two chambers—the Council of the Union and the Council of Nationalities. The session was opened by Mikhail Gorbachev, president of the Supreme Soviet.

The MPs are to discuss the drafts of the 1990 state economic and social development plan and of the budget, submitted for its approval by the Soviet Government.

It will also consider several extremely important bills aimed at deepening political and economic reforms, harmonizing inter-ethnic relations and consolidating the unity and cohesion of soviet socialist nations. It is planned. Specifically, to discuss and submit to the Congress of People's Deputies a draft law on amendments and supplements to the Soviet Constitution, procedural rules for the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and a draft law on the status of the people's deputies of the USSR.

The agenda of the current session includes draft laws on property and cooperative ventures in the USSR, basic principles of legislation in the union and constituent republics on land, leasing and leasing relations, bills on socialist enterprise, pensions, a single taxation system, a procedure for settling collective labour disputes, on glasnost and the press, as well as other acts called forth by perestroika.

The second session of the Supreme Soviet is expected to close at the end of November.

Speakers Address Supreme Soviet Session

LD2509110589 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 25 Sep 89

[Text] Today the second session of the USSR Supreme Soviet opened. A correspondent's center of all-union radio is operating in the Kremlin. Over to Aleksandr Ravinskiy.

[Ravinskiy] The session was opened by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. He noted that extraordinary significance is attached to this session, and that the proposals of the Supreme Soviet Presidium on the agenda make it possible to work on developing the measures which the people are awaiting. First of all, though, the plan for socioeconomic development up to 1990 has to be adopted, and Mikhail Sergeyevich noted that any decisions must be well-argued, considered, and responsible. Measures to improve the health of the economy are needed.

Well, it must be said that this session has given rise to enormous interest among journalists. Perhaps not since the Congress of People's Deputies have there been so many of them in the Kremlin. A great many people's deputies who are members of the Supreme Soviet have come to this session today.

In his opening words, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave a brief analysis of the socio-economic situation in the country, and then Comrade Lukyanov described in brief the agenda which has been proposed, and which was developed in conjunction with the chairmen of the commissions and committees. All in all, there are about 60 items on this agenda. It was noted that the center of gravity in the work on the draft laws now rests mainly on the committees and commissions, where they will be carefully discussed.

Then the deputies made their proposals on the agenda. These proposals were diverse in nature; many of them are, in essence, reflected in the agenda which has been proposed. For instance, it was proposed that the results of work by the commissions which the Congress created should be examined first of all. The issue was also raised of the discrediting of people's deputies in certain of the mass media. To be specific, there was discussion of published material in the newspaper PRAVDA which compromised Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. It was decided to examine this as a special matter.

Deputies also delivered information on the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev proposed that the discussion on the agenda be halted, and put this matter to the vote. The new electronic system was to be tested for the first time. For some reason, however, it was not possible to do this, possibly because electronic registration of the deputies was not carried out in advance. They voted, as before, by raising their hands, and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's proposal was adopted by a majority vote. The discussion was halted.

After an interval, Comrade Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, took the floor for a report on the plan for socioeconomic development of the country up to 1990. He noted that this plan is essentially the initial part of a long-term socio-economic policy. Comrade Voronin described the economic situation in the country, and said that it was more difficult this year than a year ago. Social tension is great. This year, production has turned out to be lower than last year for 62 of the 178 most important products of industry and agriculture. These include such important products as oil, coal, fertilizers, gasoline, sawn timber, sugar, and conserved foods. Well, Comrade Voronin noted that there are also positive phenomena which make it possible to look into the future with optimism. First of all, people's interest in work, and its results has

increased, and the extent to which measures planned by the government are implemented as a complex has increased. The new plan up to the year 1990 is characterized above all by an acute social orientation.

Comrade Voronin's report is now continuing, and with that we will end our report from the Kremlin.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Meets Central Committee Workers 21 Sep

Speech to Workers Published

PM260910189V Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Sep 89 First Edition p 2

[TASS report on M.S. Gorbachev speech at 21 September meeting at CPSU Central Committee with "a group of workers and collective farm members belonging to the party's central elected organs" published under the general heading "More Organization and Order in the Struggle for Perestroyka" "M.S. Gorbachev's Closing Address"]

[Text] It is not merely for the sake of form, but because it is appropriate that I say that I am satisfied that we have spoken so frankly. Perhaps some of you think that those "at the top" do not know everything? No, Comrades, we do. The present leadership knows the situation, takes it to heart, and goes through it all together with you.

Who most of all would like the changes and the renewal to improve and speed up, if not the party and its leadership? That is why there should be no reservations here between us. You have surely seen that for ourselves on the Central Committee. We keep our finger on the pulse of life and we sense it well. Armed with extensive information, we make decisions of a political nature in a number of areas, in the sphere of the economy, in the sphere of ideology, on matters relating to the political reform, and the activity of the party itself. What is the general thrust of these decisions? What is our position here? I am going to tell you about that bluntly, Comrades.

First and most important. We shall not back down from the methods that we have chosen in our revolutionary restructuring, even though there are many ill attempts here to divert us. We will develop our country on the bases of those values which were laid down in October. There will be no deviations. We will develop and enrich socialism and truly make it the system of the working people and for the working people, the system in which every worker and working man feels confident and knows that he is not a bystander, but the active creator of all things and that he is involved in everything. That is the main point, the main philosophy of perestroyka. Do everything to ensure that people feel needed in society and able to fully realize their potential.

It all seems simple. But the simplest thing is often also the most complex. We had no ready-made formulas and answers as to the shortest route to implementing our ideas. That is why our position was so difficult from the viewpoint of how to translate the policy of perestroyka into the real forms of life. But now we are gaining experience—albeit not without making mistakes. We have adopted a fundamentally correct Law on Enterprise. It is aimed at ensuring that people themselves are in charge in their own area of work. Yet here, too, some people have used that law for their own narrow egoistic and group purposes. Some people want to increase income and wages more quickly—even at the expense of production funds—forgetting that they need these funds, which must be renewed without fail to pay for their present and future work.

The implementation of the political reform is also proving difficult. In principle it improves all of society and liberates its spiritual potential. But at the same time, concomitantly, this healthy process is accompanied by negative manifestations which worry us all today. Thus here, too, there must be adjustments. I shall be blunt. Many problems are occurring because we did not have answers ready for all the questions thrown up by life and perestroyka. Let us seek those difficult answers together. Such is the logic of life and the development of any society. For example, we did not immediately reach the conclusion that, unless the question of ownership and of the use of various forms of socialist property was resolved, things would not work.

When raising the questions of the economic autonomy of the republics or other administrative formations and of the economic autonomy of enterprises, we must look into all these things thoroughly and fundamentally. But we must do this, mindful of the fact that enterprises in our country are bound by thousands of vital production links which took years to create. And that is why we must not thoughtlessly sever or separate these links as we go along. Neither serious politicians nor serious economists can act like that. Thus we must continue working resolutely, making the necessary adjustments and resolving questions promptly as they occur. That is the first point.

The second point. I receive and take on all your information, advice, and requirements, especially as all that you have said is not just your view—you have brought the feelings of thousands of people here with you. Indeed, we all must improve discipline in the country now in order to increase order in general. In order to do that, however, it is necessary to not only use economic mechanisms, but also the force of law and of party and educational influence, including influence via the press, television, and radio. The questions that you have raised are good. They are fair. They reflect all of society's concern that our ship should steer a steady and true course.

I entirely share your concern of the party's situation and its role in perestroyka. You know that this theme is ever-present in my public statements and conversations.

First of all I will say that those who try to attack the party also undermine perestroyka and stability in society. I am not saying this because we are all Communists here, members of the Central Committee, or even because I am general secretary, with certain official obligations. No. It is because it is appropriate, comrades.

We urgently need the strength which constantly helps to elaborate political guidelines. Society must have them if it is to know which way to go and why and on what basis to work. You cannot live without an inspiring purpose; you always need a guiding star. That is true of each man and society in general. The CPSU plays an important role, that of the uniting force in the name of social progress. Only a renewed party can achieve all this. That must be understood clearly. There are forces trying to divert us with other aims and values and to weaken society. They do not like the CPSU's firm perestroyka stance.

In this vein, I must say that we must not only preserve the force represented by our party, but also renew it and give it a powerful dynamism. If we do this, the success of the work we have begun will be assured. That is also a crucial question. We have nothing to be ashamed of. Our positions and aims are honorable. It is necessary to act. Yes, the party has had its flashdowns, its Shcherbitskiys, and the like. But they are not the ones who determined the party's face. That was done by the millions of honest Communists who are now advancing the cause of perestroyka by their own labor. So we should not equate party renegades with the party as a whole or renegades from the leadership with the leadership as a whole.

Ultimately the party will do everything in its power to sort matters out. I believe that this process, although difficult and painful, is already making progress. The elections were a loud signal to us. The party must restructure itself if it wants to retain the role of society's leader. We cannot and must not sit complacently in our offices and act in the familiar old way, whereby the apparatus twisted everyone round its little finger and gave instructions to everyone, even Central Committee members. That time has gone forever. Now you must go out to people, see what is happening in life, what is worrying people, help to make life better, develop cadres for that, and always be with people. That is the approach and style that party workers of all ranks need today.

I have already said many times that we are all the children of the October Revolution. I am categorically opposed to any attempts to change the social hue of our ideals and values. But it is a different matter that we must make the people the real master in the enterprise, in the rayon, the city, and the country. And strive through all the democratic processes to ensure that the people, above all the working class, have real power and run the country. Indeed, the people will not accept other guidelines here. We must create and suffer for our cause, the socialist cause. It will be hard and painful but I believe that we will do it, we will survive it all. That is why the party must be strengthened, and I believe that in this respect the plenum gave a good impetus both to the Central Committee and to all Communists. And this consolidating sense of responsibility of how to act, how to progress, and how to make decisions must be conveyed to all. Everyone must get away from the old and bureaucratic ways, must look for constant contact with the people. That is the main thing. But this is exactly what we currently lack.

Some Communists and party workers have adopted a defensive posture and sometimes, too, they shirk new problems and difficulties. Then the question is: What is stopping them from acting with energy and commitment? Could it be that they lack the ability? Or perhaps some people do not have sufficient ethical or moral right? There will be a struggle for people's hearts and minds, comrades. You Central Committee members must understand that. If we have started a revolution and if profound changes are already taking place, it cannot and will not all be totally simple. And we must clearly see what has happened and is happening here and the direction things are going and act promptly to prevent negative features. If we fail to see these phenomena and let it all come undone, as it were, that will greatly damage our common cause. We must not allow that. Nor can we allow the perestroyka process to slow down or be delayed. There must be no marking time. To stop is disastrous—it is to go backward, to the past where we have already been.

I agree that we must act more resolutely and now we, the Politburo and the government, are doing that. We need to resolve the question of the many shortages and ease the strain on the market place. The solution of the great social questions will take time to get started. Everyone must understand that well. But, on the other hand, it is patently obvious that we must also direct our keenest attention to the mechanism of distributing all that is produced in the country. I agree: there must be strict workers' control to ensure that scarce output does not find its way to those people who engage in speculation and profit from difficulties. It is necessary to strike a resolute blow against the speculators, the secondhand dealers, and those who produce nothing and sponge off the honest toil of others.

During the meeting I have noted what I see as the most important questions raised here. We must react to them in a fitting manner.

The comments made here on the status of CPSU Central Committee members were correct. As practice shows, this question has not been properly studied here. Communists entering the party's central elected organs do not even have a place to work, where they can receive people and talk with them. The transport question must also be resolved. People spoke correctly here about improving the prompt supply of information to Central Committee members at the local level, so that they have the necessary materials and information roundups on domestic and foreign policy questions in good time so they are completely ready to take part in debates on any question.

in the immediate future it is also necessary to consider endowing on the CPSU rights a number of new provisions connected with the rights and duties of CPSU Central Committee members.

The meeting confirmed once again that we must all act more vigorously and purposefully. There has been much talk here about local difficulties. The center has been criticized. While accepting this criticism, I must nevertheless point out that no center can do absolutely everything or do all the work in place of those at the local level. People must look less to the center in expectation of orders from above, and there must be more initiative and independence in the solution of the questions and problems that occur. Only then will perestroyka become reality. Those who dare, win [dovogu ondet obuzhchiy].

The comment made here that any management system needs intelligent cadres was right. The better, more competent, and more skilful they are, the more successfully things will progress. That is an axiom born of our whole practice and life. There is another question—we must all improve the cadre selection mechanism. The practice which existed until recently, whereby the administration appointed cadres in secret, impoverished our cadre corps and did not tap its inexhaustible potential. The country suffered as a result. We have a colossal cadre potential in all spheres of the national economy. It must be fully utilized, and cadres must be given greater independence because it is impossible to administer such a juggernaut, such a vast country as ours with all its characteristics by means of commands from the center.

The question of our Army, our defense capability has been raised here. I want to talk about it, even if only briefly. First, you have to know that we will not budge an inch when it comes to ensuring that the reliability of our defense and the country's security are properly safeguarded. To that end we must have a modern army equipped with everything necessary and surrounded by the concern and support of the people, so that its officers and men feel that both now and in the future they will have all that they need to perform their duty. The question of the Army must always be resolved on principle as follows. Everything necessary in the interests of the country and of its security must be done. The Army is the offspring of the people, it is the people's flesh and blood and must serve the people's interests, and that should never be forgotten under any circumstances.

It goes without saying that, in the conditions of the new realities taking shape in the world, we also have to take a new look at the questions of ensuring our defense capability. We have ventured a substantial reduction in military expenditure and a cut in the proportion of national income spent on armament needs. While reducing expenditure for these purposes, we are paying attention to the qualitative rearmament of the Army, and in this way we are not permitting the overall level of our defense capability to be weakened in any degree. I would like to observe in passing that the once essentially closed sphere of our defense interests is becoming increasingly open and subject to monitoring [kontrolirovaniye]. And this is a guarantee that, here, too, everything will be done in the interests of the people themselves. That, by the way, was precisely Lenin's slogan for building the Land of the Soviets' Armed Forces.

Of course, the difficult and frequently acute perestroyka processes have also affected our Armed Forces. But today everything is being restructured: the economy, science, and the party, too. And, as I have already observed more than once, all this touches people to a greater or lesser extent and affects their real and customary interests. We have to make progress by overcoming all this and renewing ourselves. It will take character, it will take resolution. There must be no shirking, no giving in to difficulties, no ruling the current. The situation has to be changed, the circumstances controlled, and practical questions resolved—I emphasize—at all levels, from the center down to the labor collective.

The question of the upcoming soviet elections has also been raised at the meeting here. They are a big task, and the person who observed that the party is responsible for their outcome, as it was for the complex situation in which the working class found itself during the previous election campaign, was right. While I accept that observation, I hope at the same time that the working class will not sit with its arms folded either but will learn a good lesson for itself from everything that has happened. The working class and the party must and will act in unison. All the best and most vigorous experience that has now crystallized from within the working class must be transferred, must be taken into the soviets. The most prestigious, the most active representatives of the working class and the peasantry must enter the soviets. And of the intelligentsia, too, of course. Only that can guarantee the soviets' vitality. That is our starting point.

To wind up this conversation, I want to support once again what you have said. Let us boost our unity, get everything in order, and raise discipline and responsibility for actions and behavior. Let us be bolder about going out to the people, entering into political debates, and acting confidently. We are on the right road, and that is the main thing. As for the specific questions raised here, which are worrying us all, we have to resolve them in the very near future through the common efforts of the party and the people.

Further on Meeting

LD2609191189 Moscow TASS in English 1909 GMT 26 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev met on September 21 with a large group of workers and collective farmers who are elected members of the party's ruling bodies.

A sincere circumstantial talk took place covering an extensive range of issues of concern for working people and matters relating to the functioning of party organizations.

The participants at the meeting discussed with interest the progression of political and economic reform and voiced a number of concrete proposals for improving the activity of the Soviet cooperative movement, the situation in the industry, agriculture and the Soviet Armed Forces.

Voicing support for perestroyka objectives, many speakers noted that the success of perestroyka depended to a considerable extent on the personal contribution of each worker and the upgraded discipline of all.

Siding with the other speakers at the meeting, Spinner V. Cherkashina of the Kamyshin cotton mill (Volgograd region) said that unless work were done at each work place so as to exclude the need to re-make what has been made, the things would never get going in the country as a whole.

Speakers expressed support for the policy of the Communist Party, the force which initiated perestroyka. They stressed that their hopes for the success of perestroyka were linked with the party's plans and its renewal.

At the same time, the participants of the meeting voiced concern over the fact that many party officials in the localities had lost initiative and reacted impassively to often sweeping criticism levelled against the Communist Party.

Turner V. Adyiev of the Tashkent aircraft-making plant voiced regret that while there were many speakers at the Congress of People's Deputies whose criticism of the party was ungrounded, "Not a single secretary of a regional or a city party committee spoke in defence of the party."

In conclusion the meeting was addressed by Mikhail Gorbachev.

He stressed, among other things, the firm adherence of the party to the cause of perestroyka. "We shall never go back on the approaches we opted for on the revolutionary perestroyka," Gorbachev said.

"We shall develop our country on the basis of those values which were laid down by the October revolution. From this, there will be no retreat," the general secretary stressed.

Speaking about the progression of political reform, Mikhail Gorbachev said that, in principle, it normalizes the whole life of society and set free its intellectual potential.

But at the same time, this wholesome process is accompanied by adverse phenomena of concern for all. It follows, that correctives are needed on this, too, he pointed out.

Mikhail Gorbachev said that he shared the anxiety of the participants for the situation in the party and its role in perestroyka.

"First of all, I shall say that he who encroaches upon the party, undermines both perestroyka and stability in society," he stressed. "The party is absolutely essential as the rallying force for social progress."

"All this can only be ensured by a renewed party. In this connection I must say," Gorbachev went on, "that if we not only preserve the force which is our party, but renew it and make it more dynamic—the success of the undertaked drive will be secured."

"Our positions and our objectives are honest," the general secretary stressed. "True, there were Rashidovs, Shcherbitskys and the like in the party," he said, "but the party's image was evolved not by those people but by millions of honest Communists whose efforts are now contributing to the promotion of perestroyka. This is why no equation mark can be placed between party renegades and the party itself, between renegade leaders and leadership as a whole."

In replying to questions from participants at the meeting about Soviet Armed Forces and the country's defence capability, Mikhail Gorbachev noted that the country should not retreat by an inch from the line at which its defence and security can be properly guaranteed.

It is obvious, that in conditions of new realities emerging in the world we must view the questions of securing our defence capability in a new light, Gorbachev went on to say.

We began substantial cuts in our military spending and a reduction of the share of the national income embarked for armaments, he recalled.

While cutting our expenditures for these purposes, we concentrate our attention upon a qualitative rearmament of the Army and, in so doing, we by no means allow any weakening of the general level of our defence capability, he stressed.

Another question raised at the meeting concerned the forthcoming elections to local soviets.

This is a great work and the party shoulders the responsibility for its outcome, as it does for the complex situation in which the working class found itself in the course of the previous election campaign, Gorbachev stressed.

The working class and the party must and will act in cooperation.

All that is of the best and the most vigorous that has crystallized within the working class must be transferred, handed over to the soviets, he pointed out. The most influential and vigorous representatives of the working class, peasantry, and the intelligentsia must enter the soviets, or local councils, he pointed out. This will be the only guarantee of their viability, Gorbachev said.

Gorbachev Discusses Party in Society

LD2309161489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1714 GMT 24 Sep 89

[Excerpts] Moscow, 24 Sep (TASS)—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met a large group of workers and collective farmers who are members of the party's central elected bodies. [passage omitted]

In conclusion, Mikhail Gorbachev spoke at the meeting. In particular, he emphasized the party's adherence to the policies of perestroyka. We will not, Mikhail Gorbachev said, renounce those approaches on which we embarked during revolutionary perestroyka. But at the same time, incidentally, this healthy process is also accompanied by negative phenomena which worry us all today. So we need amendments here as well, he emphasized.

Mikhail Gorbachev said that he fully shares the concern of the meeting's participants about the party's position and its role in perestroyka.

"Above all, I would say that the person who encroaches on the party is also undermining perestroyka and stability in society," he emphasized.

The CPSU is extremely necessary to us as a uniting force in the name of social progress. Only a renewed party may guarantee this. In connection with this, I must say, Mikhail Gorbachev continued, that if we not only preserve but also renew such a force as our party, if we import a powerful dynamism to it, success for the business begun will be guaranteed.

Our positions and aims are honest, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee emphasized. "Yes, there have been Rashidovs, Shcherbitskys and such like in the party," he said, "but it's not they who have determined the image of the party but the millions of honest Communists who are now advancing the cause of perestroyka through their labor. For this reason you cannot equate party renegades with the party as a whole, or leadership renegades with the leadership as a whole."

Replying to questions from participants in the meeting about the Soviet Army and the country's defense capability, Mikhail Gorbachev noted that the country will not yield a millimeter on the fact that its reliable defense and its security would always be provided for in the proper manner.

Of course, in the conditions of the new realities taking shape in the world we must also examine anew issues of ensuring our defense capability, Mikhail Gorbachev continued. We have embarked upon a significant reduction in our military expenditure and a decrease in the proportion of national income which goes toward armament needs. In reducing our expenditure for these purposes we are concentrating our attention on a high quality upgrading of the Army's armaments and in doing this we are not permitting to any degree a reduction in the overall level of our defense capability. [passage omitted]

PRAVDA Details 20 Sep CPSU Plenum Debate

PM2709114389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 89 Second Edition pp 1-3

[TASS report: "Debate at CPSU Central Committee Plenum: On Leninist Principles—Toward a New Quality of Interethnic Relations"]

[Text] Discussion of M.S. Gorbachev's report continued 20 September at the morning sitting of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The profound and comprehensive discussion of the draft party platform on the nationalities question. I.A. Karimov, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, pointed out in his speech, attests to the people's support for the CPSU Central Committee's chosen course of improving interethnic relations and building the Soviet federation under new conditions.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's substantive and constructive report at the plenum once again underlines the insistent need to critically analyze the path we have traveled in forming interethnic relations in our country, in asserting the creative development of Leninist norms and principles in nationalities policy, and in purging them of artificial accretions and deformations.

Obviously, today's plenum is not the most suitable moment to speak about significant dates and especially about jubilees but I cannot not do this. I am talking about a question that has a direct bearing on the problems we are discussing today. I am referring to the impending 70th anniversary of Tashkent State University. Let us recall, comrades, the dreadful year of 1920 when Russia—cold, hungry, and rent by civil war—extended the hand of generous aid to the peoples of Turkestan. It was in that far-off year that Vladimir Ilich Lenin signed the decree on the formation of the Turkestan university. It was then that the famous scientific team set off for Tashkent carrying prominent scientists and teachers from Moscow, Petrograd, and other cities in Russia. This cannot be forgotten, comrades.

This fraternal aid will never be erased from the grateful memory of the Uzbek people and the peoples of Central Asia. That is why we are preparing so vigorously for this important event in order to emphasize once again that the questions raised by life itself and the perestroyka of our relations can only be successfully resolved within the single united family of the Soviet peoples. We simply do not have any other option.

When speaking about this, it is hard, indeed impossible, to understand some mass media articles regarding recent events in Uzbekistan, in particular in Fergana Oblast. It is inadmissible when individual busybodies with no knowledge of our specific conditions, age-old history, culture, traditions, morals, customs, or of the difficult key problems that caused these events, categorically pin labels on an entire people, paint them black, and consider themselves to be supreme judges.

The speaker described the article entitled "Eclipse" published in the journal OGONEK, as one of these sweeping biased articles, which aggravate the already explosive social tension in the republic. In his opinion, such articles do not ease but, on the contrary, complicate the solution of the acute pressing problems which have built up in Uzbekistan in large numbers.

We by no means intend to over-simplify the actual reasons behind the tragic events that occurred in Fergana. I.A. Karimov continued, moreover, we condemn such attempts and consider them politically harmful. The events in Fergana Oblast illustrate above all our underestimation of the danger of the deterioration of the tense sociopolitical situation which was brought about by attempts on the part of corrupt antiperestroyka and nationalist elements to exploit the exceptionally complex socioeconomic and moral-psychological situation in the republic to kindle extortionist dissension.

The speaker went on to talk about the lessons that the republic is deriving from the events in Fergana.

The Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, he said, has made a harsh assessment of the tragic events in Fergana Oblast. Criminal proceedings have been instituted against the culprits. The firm conviction has taken shape in the republic that the culprits, whoever they may be and whatever nation they may belong to, must and will be severely punished to ensure that no one ever takes it into their head again to cast a slur on the good name of the Uzbek people, who are distinguished by their true internationalism, benevolence, spiritual goodness, and hospitality.

The Uzbek people were, are, and will always be the true friends and brothers of all Soviet peoples.

The speaker then dwelt on the problems that are complicating the sociopolitical situation in the region. Above all, the question of employment for the population. Today approximately 1 million mobile manpower resources are unemployed in the republic in the sphere of social production. This situation is being aggravated by the population growth rate, which is approximately three times the union growth rate. Moreover this increase is not backed up by a corresponding increase in vital services, housing, educational, public health, cultural, trade, consumer, and municipal facilities, and other services.

The result of the lack of work for people, particularly in rural areas, is low social labor productivity and, correspondingly, low income for the population and a drastic lag in per capita figures for national income with all the consequences which that entails.

More than 45 percent of the population in Uzbekistan today have a per capita income of less than R 75—that is, below the living wage.

The situation, the speaker continued, is complicated by the one-sided and hypertrophied development of the national economy, where non-labor intensive production units and primary processing sectors primarily prevail. The agricultural structure needs to be substantially revised in connection with the increasingly limited water resources. Today in the Fergana Valley there is no more than 0.2 hectares of land per capita and this indicator is dropping every year. The miscalculations and voluntarism permitted in developing the siting of productive forces have created an exceptionally tense ecological situation. This is illustrated by the catastrophic situation that is taking shape around the Aral.

If you add to this list of problems the serious mistakes, the distortions, and the administrative-edict, willful, and crude approach permitted in the so-called cotton scams (khlopkovyye delakh) and also in assessing the historical and cultural values, customs, and traditions of the people, then the soil on which the social and interethnic tensions is growing in the republic today also becomes understandable.

We understand and realize that the resolution of all these difficult problems depends primarily on us ourselves. On how we organize the work of utilizing available opportunities and resources. However, in our view, we cannot do without the elaboration of a comprehensive program encompassing our entire Central Asian region. Union leaders must take charge of the elaboration of this program.

With the help of the CPSU Central Committee and the country's government, I.A. Karimov said, the republic is conducting an insistent quest for ways to reduce economic and social tension by above all more fully utilizing existing potential. As an immediate measure designed to produce a rapid return, we recently decided to develop personal subsidiary plots and individual housing construction. We are thus trying to resolve several tasks at once. We are improving the population's food supply, incorporating an important reserve into the acceleration of housing construction, increasing employment for the population, and improving their social security.

We are currently working hard to strengthen and develop the base for the storage and processing of agricultural produce, above all fruit and vegetables. We should no longer tolerate the fact that up to 30 percent of vitamin output, which our entire country and republic need so acutely, is lost owing to mismanagement.

Our republic's working people greeted with great satisfaction the decision adopted the other day on the stabilization of cotton fiber production at 1.5 million tonnes and the introduction of extra charges [nadbavki] on cotton growing.

The improvement in the sociopolitical situation is directly linked with the urgent and just resolution of the demands made by the Crimean Tatars, Meskhetian Turks, and Kurds deported to Uzbekistan in the past, the speaker said. We wholly support the idea expressed in the report about the need for the speediest resolution of this historic injustice.

Our links with the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan have considerably strengthened recently. Today it can be said unambiguously that there are no unresolved problems between our fraternal peoples.

And you were quite right to note yesterday, Mikhail Sergeyevich, that we should not be complaining about each other but cooperating. If we have been born as neighbors on this land, we should obviously be as tolerant as possible, understand each other the way that we are, find a common language, and build our future.

We are no point on working alternatives to our state's federal makeup. Yes, we advocate the clear demarcation of the functions, powers, and mutual obligations of the union and the republics and, as the draft platform said, the comprehensive strengthening of the republics' sovereignty and the basing of our relationships on full economic accountability. We advocate giving new content to the concept of the "Soviet federation" and returning to a genuinely Leninist concept of federation which permits neither a unitary state [unitarnost] nor the dissolution of democratic centralism into the absolute diktat of a bureaucratic system.

At the same time, the speaker stressed, we cannot accept the proposal made by certain republics to base our relationships on the principles of confederation. This, we are profoundly convinced, will inevitably lead to an increase in parochialism and the development of centrifugal forces and sentiments, and will ultimately result in the collapse of our state.

The draft platform's raising of the question of strengthening the existing structure of the republic communist parties' autonomy and granting these parties the right to resolve organizational, structural, cadre, and financial issues as they see fit and to adopt their own political documents within the bounds of the CPSU Program is timely and highly topical. At the same time, we cannot fail to agree with the suggestions about granting union republic communist parties the right to adopt a program and statutes independently. The CPSU has always been strengthened by the unity of its ranks, goals, and tasks. We also believe that the firm directives heard yesterday in the report on the need to apply the force of the law where necessary—to ultraradicals, extremists, chauvinists, nationalists, and anyone who strives to undermine the people's confidence in the party and take us away from the course of perestroyka—to be correct.

G.I. Usmanov, first secretary of Tatar Oblast party committee [obkom], who then spoke, said that it was entirely correct and timely to raise the question of bringing forward the next party congress, which should provide answers to the questions associated with party's renewal and the determination of its place and role in the revolutionary transformations of society.

All the republic's working people have taken a keen interest in the CPSU's draft political platform. This document and the provisions of M.S. Gorbachev's report are a major step forward in interpreting the national processes taking place in the country and serve as a good basis for formulating the party's present-day nationalities policy. Without an integrated and realistic nationalities policy based on the rebirth of Leninist principles we will be unable to improve the situation or make progress along the road of perestroyka.

In our multinational republic, the speaker noted, Tatars have from ancient times lived and worked alongside Russians, Chuvashes, the Mari, Mordvinians, Udmurts, and representatives of many other peoples for whom Tataria has been their homeland for more than one generation. That is why we are trying today to do everything possible to augment the age-old traditions of good-neighborliness and friendship so as to ensure that the warm climate of interethnic relations that has long existed is not darkened by dissension or clashes on ethnic grounds. New schools, preschools, and higher educational establishment [VUZ] specialities with teaching and training in national languages are being opened. Radio and TV broadcasts have been organized in the Bashkirian, Chuvash, Udmurt, Mari, and Mordvinian tongues as have performances by amateur arts collectives of Tatars living in other oblasts and krays in the country; radio and TV broadcasts are being exchanged with union and autonomous republics, and Tatar language and Arabic script lessons are being taught.

But I am by no means idealizing the situation. People today are openly stating just what worries and alarms them and are calling on us to take more vigorous action to resolve the entire range of issues that have accumulated in interethnic relations. This was reaffirmed yet again during the discussion of the CPSU platform for this plenum.

A considerable number of the proposals put forward concern the question of the incomplete nature of the existing national-state makeup of the USSR. As is well known, as a result of the deformation of the Leninist nationalities policy the peoples have found themselves in unequal positions. Some have gained the status of union republic, other have obtained the status of autonomous republic, while certain peoples have been deprived of both. Today this situation is generating justifiable criticism and sometimes even a painful reaction from people.

The reality is that many autonomous republics, while in no way inferior to certain union republics in terms of their economic, scientific, technical, and spiritual potential, population numbers, and other parameters, do have far fewer opportunities for their own development. The difference is felt in literally everything. The scope of lawmaking is narrower and their rights and opportunities in the economy and the social sphere are limited. A considerable proportion of questions of a purely internal nature have to be resolved via the center.

This ranking of republics enshrined not just a hierarchy of forms of national statehood but of national cultures too. The rights and opportunities of autonomous republics are much inferior to that of union republics. For example, in terms of the volume of republic radio broadcasting and television, in publishing, the development of cinematography, the mass media, and other questions. This has already been spoken about by autonomous republic oblast committee [obkom] secretaries from this rostrum. And all these questions in the present atmosphere are far from discrete in nature; they exert a very marked influence on people's national feeling. Sociological research carried out in the republic, the speaker went on, has shown that 67 percent of respondents see enhancement of autonomous republics' status to the level of union republics as a way out of the current situation. Or they propose abandoning altogether the division of republics into union and autonomous.

The idea of providing the opportunity to develop forms of national statehood and autonomy and the emergence of new national formations should be reflected in the CPSU platform on the nationalities question. After all, nations and national relations are developing. But for some reason the national and state forms of their existence have become ossified for many decades. This is, incidentally, recognized in the CPSU draft platform, but I think this should be more clearly worded and we should subsequently enshrine in law the opportunity to enhance the status of any autonomous unit and enable its transition to higher forms of national statehood as it makes political, socioeconomic, and spiritual progress and its national self-awareness grows.

Scientifically validated criteria in keeping with perestroyka do, of course, have to be elaborated and a constitutional legal mechanism created which will make it possible in the light of the expressed will of the peoples themselves to carry out transformations of the existing national formations and create new ones. It is essential right now to start elaborating the fundamentals of the legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics on a federation of interethnic relations. I consider perfectly well-founded the question on the legal status of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] as a sovereign federated state put on the draft platform. This will make it possible to take fuller account of and to resolve the national problems of the peoples of Russia, including the Russian people, which we often forget about. In this regard I would like to support the proposal expressed by comrades that a communist party of the Russian Federation be organized instead of the proposed CPSU Central Committee Bureau or Secretariat for the RSFSR and that other structures existing in union republics be created.

Speaking about the problem of economic independence, the speaker noted that the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] is among the most economically developed regions of the Russian Federation. Yet the standard of material prosperity and social provision of its population is lower than the average for Russia for a whole number of very important indicators. This has to be said because the present economic situation has a direct effect upon people's national feeling and can serve as a catalyst for not just social but national tension too. It has to be said that such a situation infringes upon the rights of not just the indigenous nationality.

For example, the Russians living in the Tatar ASSR are in an unequal position compared with Russians living in union republics. Here, in our view, the speaker said, it is necessary to expand and give concrete expression to the provisions of the draft which deal with autonomous republics' economic independence. Genuine economic accountability demands that they be granted the rights to own and use the land, its mineral resources, and timber, water, and other natural resources on their own territory. They must also be granted the right to choose the model of economic accountability in the light of their own specific features. The budgetary autonomy of republics and territories should also be substantially enhanced. They have the right to tackle these spheres themselves and allocate available resources.

Analysis of our economic potential shows that the Tatar ASSR is capable of ensuring its development through its own resources and meeting its payments to the state budgets of the USSR and Russia. According to our calculations, the republic's income should exceed expenditure by somewhat over R2 billion. The republic is now virtually ready to switch to regional economic accountability and we ask the appropriate organs to speed up their examination of the fundamental normative acts and thereby open up the opportunity for the development of this very important process at the present stage of perestroyka.

Touching on the acute question of compensation for the environmental damage caused to various regions of the country as a result of their industrial exploitation, the party obkom first secretary noted that in the Tatar ASSR, for example, around 2.5 billion tonnes of petroleum has been extracted to date. Even at today's extremely low petrol prices, this amounts to R250 billion. However, the republic has got virtually nothing in the past or today from this. And the situation in our petroleum regions is close to catastrophic. The situation is made worse by the fact that the Tatar nuclear power plant is also being built in Prikamye, where the largest enterprises—which generate more than R10 billion of gross national product—are concentrated on a small area.

More than 1 million people live there, and there will be more than 1.5 million in the next few years.

The republic's scientists have demonstrated that the wrong site was chosen. In a tectonic fracture zone the accident-free operation of the station is in jeopardy, therefore it is necessary to halt the construction of the station, which, incidentally, is being constructed without approved planning and estimate documents. The USSR Academy of Sciences commission set up at our request by the USSR Council of Ministers agreed with this, but the question remains open to this day. Construction continues, causing public concern and creating very great social tension. We would ask that this question be reexamined in the very near future and that it be decided to convert this nuclear power station to a thermal power station.

The public in our republic greeted with great approval the fact that the CPSU platform essentially for the first time pays attention to the problem of people living outside their own national-state formations, the speaker continued. Until recently people who have been torn away from their ethnic roots and native soil by the will of fate have not exactly had attention lavished on them. We are strongly aware of this, because we receive a large number of letters from Tatars living in more than 80 regions of the country, many of whom say that their national-cultural needs are not being met. We are endeavoring to respond as fully as possible to their requests, we are helping by supplying textbooks, literature, and cultural services, and we are training and retraining ethnic cadres. But these are only half-measures.

At the moment only 50 percent of, for example, the demand for books in Tatar is being met, yet this demand is constantly increasing. The republic's paper stocks and other material resources are not geared to meeting the ethnic requirements of a people numbering many millions. Meanwhile it is recommended that all these questions be tackled locally. But we do not have the resources. The solution as we see it is to tackle two interrelated questions. First, a mechanism should be devised to compensate for the expenditure incurred by a particular republic in meeting the national-cultural needs of people living outside it. Second, it is necessary to legislate and make material provision for the rights of ethnic groups living outside their own national-territorial formations or lacking such formations. In this connection, I believe it is necessary to authorize the creation of ethnic rayons and rural and settlement soviets in areas where nationalities are concentrated, irrespective of whether they have their own national-territorial formations.

The processes which are commonly called the growth of ethnic self-awareness and which have been defined as "ethnic awakening" in Soviet Latvia, are, in my view, not a by-product, but an integral part of perestroyka.

Latvian Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary Ya.Ya. Vagris said in his speech. And it is perfectly logical that we should be discussing today not just the refinement of interethnic relations, but a new model for them, a new concept for the party's nationalities policy.

It was with satisfaction that we observed in the CPSU draft platform many of the provisions which were expressed in the republic during the preparation for the plenum. When discussing the draft platform itself, the communists and working people of Soviet Latvia rated highly the overall democratic thrust and constructive nature of the document, although there was criticism that it had failed to pay sufficient attention to the specific historical and ethnic features of regions and republics and that some of its sections were to some extent merely formal statements.

The discussion of the draft platform coincided here with the work of the republican party organization Central Committee 17th plenum, which ended with the adoption of the Latvian Communist Party's action program for the period of preparation for its 29th Congress and on very important questions of a longer-term nature.

In the current complex situation, the Latvian Communist Party action program, devised on a collective and democratic basis and in accordance with glasnost, will, we believe, contribute to the consolidation of all healthy forces in society in the struggle to attain the goals of perestroyka and will have a stabilizing effect on social and political processes in the republic.

I want to draw your attention to just four problems, which have a direct bearing on the party's nationalities policy.

First, the Latvian Communist Party fully supports the CPSU platform conclusion on the need for radical transformations of the Soviet federation and on its qualitative renewal and advocates Latvia's sovereignty as part of a federation of Soviet republics based on treaty arrangements which reflect fully and concretely enough the specific features of the development of each republic or region. It is a stable treaty system that can most effectively safeguard the right of each republic, including the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], to tackle questions of its state, economic and public life independently.

The CPSU platform rightly stresses that the development of our federation will be stable and successful given an optimal correlation between the rights of the union republics and of the USSR as a whole. This requires a clear delineation of the competence and mutual obligations of the Union and the republics. The party's political attitude to the actual presentation of the issue is set out in the section "How to restructure the Soviet federation and make it full-fledged."

But one cannot help seeing its obvious contradictions the speaker believes. He dwelt on certain passages which, in his view, need redrafting.

Logic itself suggests that one should start by fully defining the rights and competences of the republic and then define the limits on its sovereignty and what the union republics have to consciously and voluntarily accept for the sake of the existence and successful development of the union state. This, in my view, the speaker continued, should be taken into account by the Congress of People's Deputies when finalizing these documents.

We favor real, not formal, sovereignty for the union republics, a new status, and the filling of the federation with modern substance, but we certainly do not favor its destruction.

Second, we regard as particularly important the CPSU platform conclusion that economic upkeep, self-determination, and sovereignty in present-day conditions are expressed in the republics' transfer to economic accountability and self-financing. On 1 January next year Latvia switches to the new conditions, and our main task in the sphere of the republic's socioeconomic development is to ensure high-quality preparation for this.

One of the first major real steps in perestroyka in a sphere on which so far there has still been little success is being taken. The Latvian Communist Party's prestige will depend to a large extent on how we cope with this task.

People expect us to really demonstrate our ability to fully bring into play the tremendous, still untapped potential contained within the Soviet federation. Both the transition and work in the new conditions will be the best argument against manifestations of separatism, for they will graphically demonstrate our ability to solve urgent socioeconomic problems within the context of the USSR.

Our actions to transfer the republic to economic accountability and self-financing meet with understanding at the level of the country's top party-state leadership. However, at lower levels we run up against departmental egoism and sometimes even a reluctance to go into this problem. Unless we smash the bureaucratic departmental obstacles through common efforts, there will be no success either in our republic or in the others, and economic accountability and economic autonomy will exist only on paper.

We listened carefully to Yu.D. Masyukov's speech. We know and greatly value his energy and efforts in resolving problems of economic accountability, however, we are worried by the fears expressed yesterday regarding the radical steps upheld by the Baltic republics. In present conditions sluggishness and irresolution can produce only negative results. We are prepared to act in conditions that are in many respects experimental and to assume responsibility, and we believe that initiatives that today are still an experiment but in a while may become the practice for many people should be supported in the common interest.

The change in the relationship between the union and the republics and their new status do not constitute an aim in themselves. The goal is to place the entire spectrum of relations on a natural, normal basis of mutual interest, equivalence of exchange, and stability and predictability of ties and pledges. We are still dependent on each other and must stay together, but not because we are doomed to do so but because we are really interested in this.

Third. The republic is vigorously and trenchantly discussing the problem of the perestroyka of the party itself. The conclusions of the 18 July conference of the CPSU Central Committee, and also the approaches outlined in the draft CPSU platform served as a considerable stimulus to debate. In parallel with the union republic's attainment of real sovereignty, the status of its Communist Party must also change. After all, one without the other will inevitably turn into a purely formal declaration. In our opinion, the process must harmoniously embrace both aspects of the political reform: the perestroyka of state and party relations.

We are faced objectively, by virtue of the very logic of perestroyka, with the problem of a new status for the union republic Communist Party. The dialectics here are simple. The status of a Communist Party, say the Latvian Communist Party, within the CPSU must be consonant with Soviet Latvia's real sovereignty as part of the USSR.

Fourth. In many regions of our country, including the Baltic republics, the problems that have accumulated over past decades precisely in the sphere of national relations are a kind of catalyst of social tension. The Latvian Communist Party bases its nationalities policy on the clear understanding that Latvian soil is the only historical territory where the free development of the Latvian nation, its culture, and its language can be ensured, but at the same time guarantees of the development of the language and culture of all the national and ethnic groups living there must be created.

The renewal of nationalities policy and the elimination of the deformations of past years are impossible without overcoming dogmatism in understanding the dialectics of national and international values and interests. This cannot be achieved unless real policy is based on a recognition that the national is an integral part of the general human, that national nihilism has nothing in common with internationalism, and that true internationalist values take shape only on the basis of national values, and not in place of them or as a counterweight to them. The principle of national self-criticism, as it were, is of exceptional significance for the practice of interethnic contact in general and in our republic in particular.

In this connection the speaker proposed adding an appropriate thesis to one paragraph of the CPSU platform.

Substantial changes in sociopolitical life have taken place within a short time in Latvia, he said, they are proceeding in a contradictory fashion, and political radicalism has been making itself felt, especially of late. This is also mentioned with alarm and concern in the CPSU Central Committee Statement of 26 August. The statement aroused a broad and distinctly mixed reaction in the republic and prompted a large number of articles in the mass media of the whole country.

During these days we have often turned to the words of the draft CPSU platform reminding us that, in countering any trends of nationalism, it is important to be sensitive and responsive to all legitimate national demands and aspirations. Indeed, the situation in Soviet Latvia remains complex and equivocal in many respects thanks to the actions and appeals of certain representatives of particular social formations to suit their overweening political ambitions.

But the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee is convinced, and stated as much in its address to the republic's Communists and all its working people, that the activeness of the extremist groupings attempting to bar the way to perestroyka from various directions does not have and cannot have a decisive influence on the processes of renewal in the republic.

The floor was given to A.I. Volskiy, chairman of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] Special Administration Committee. Dwelling on questions of interethnic relations, he stressed that they were never as free and dandy as they were portrayed as being by the propaganda media for many years. Perestroyka merely awakened belief and hopes of a solution to historically neglected questions. The lack of proper political culture in the defense of national, local interests and the occasional divergent of statewide interests brought the situation into a complex state.

Today many peoples do not feel totally satisfied. This discontent is increasingly often taking the form of diametrically opposed viewpoints and even open clashes. And there is a marked increase in the aggressiveness and implacability of each conflict. In a number of regions, in the speaker's opinion, the situation has simply gotten out of control and has led local organs to make concessions verging on total capitulation.

Never before have separatist calls and centrifugal ideas been so openly voiced. It is particularly alarming that the development of events in many regions is following virtually the same lines. While rightly naming growth in national self-awareness as one of the signs of restructuring, you cannot also fail to see at the same time that this process is a painful one and sometimes develops into rivalry over whose nation is the more ancient, the more "Aryan," the more cultured. And, because this cannot be proved by reason, the way to force becomes open. Nationalism is always provocation. What is more, young people become its first victims. After all, those staging managing events in Sumgait, Abkhazia, Fergana, Nagorno-Karabakh, and other areas do not take to the streets themselves. They incite young people to embark on pogroms and demonstrations against the militia and the Army. And the young people are the ones who are on the receiving end of the counter attack to protect the law.

In the opinion of the speaker, the aims of these national patriots are the same: a struggle for power, a gamble on unlimited parcheslations, and a struggle to return again to Rashidovism, Medunovism, Kunayevism, and Aliyevism, only better disguised this time, more widespread and better protected.

In many cases, our state looks simply undefended. Backing up this idea with a number of arguments, the speaker stressed that a definite historical stage is needed to accumulate healthy democratic experience. While this experience is being accumulated and established, society must be able to protect its foundations and restructuring, like any other revolution, must know how to defend itself.

The need to broaden the rights and powers of internal troops in the event of mass riots and threats to citizens' safety is extremely topical. The situation generally with the rights of servicemen and members of the militia, he said, is absurd at present. How pathetically concerned we are for the rights of the individual and how often we forget that servicemen and members of the militia are individuals. To send them in unarmed against a mad fanatic is virtually tantamount to murder. It is the duty of the state to ensure maximum safety and protection for law enforcement bodies in conflicts with antistate elements. It is probably advisable to think about transferring a number of subunits of internal troops to a professional system.

The main task of the present Central Committee plenum is to discuss fundamental, strategic ideas designed to sharply improve the situation in the country. The CPSU platform and the report by M.S. Gorbachev give a modern understanding and new interpretation of the principles of Lenin's nationalities policy. The main task seems to be to develop the fundamental principle: nations' right to self-determination. It cannot simply be reduced to republican sovereignty or the slogan "nothing less than secession." It also implies broader rights for every people to have the opportunity to create any form of national and cultural statehood within the framework of the USSR, the right of every nation to decide the question of the possibility of changing the form of its statehood within existing borders, and the right to reject its own autonomy and decide the question of its identity in other political and administrative forms. This is precisely the aim of restructuring. To give the population of every region broad rights and powers allowing them to resolve many questions.

Moving on to the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh, the chairman of the Special Administration Committee said that we have still not made up our minds to call a spade a spade and reveal the full depth of the conflict in this region. M.S. Gorbachev's report possibly gave the first hard-hitting, fair assessment of the events taking place here. Having worked in this region for 1 year and 7 months, I cannot predict the restoration of lasting peace here in the near future unless necessary, adequate measures are taken.

The reality is that, because of Nagorno-Karabakh, the formal and informal leaders of Azerbaijan and Armenia are constantly facing the situation and not seeking good relations. There are no steps toward friendship or even toward an acceptable relationship. No one wants to make even minor concessions. If we look the truth in the face, the republics are now on the brink of intercethnic war and are often stepping over this brink. The Karabakh issue is sometimes linked with perestroyka—the Western mass media are particularly assiduous in this respect, but we are some of our own mass media as well. But believe me, the speaker said, there is no justification for this. Perestroyka has still not even reached our region.

The point lies elsewhere: in crude mistakes by the leading organs of both republics. And we ourselves have mainly chosen the tactics of calling for reconciliation, friendship, and "roundtable" negotiations. There is no doubt that this course of action would have helped to check the escalation of the conflict to some extent. But throughout this time both formal and informal leaders have openly ignored these appeals, boycotted one another, and themselves fueled emotions among their own people.

Even during the tragic events of November-December last year, when hundreds of thousands of people were driven from both republics, even then the leaders of republican organizations did not come to their senses, stop and think, and extend a hand to one another.

This mutual estrangement, the endless accusations against the other side, and the refusal to consider its interests are the main reasons why there is still tension in the region. Incidentally, the speaker said, even after the recent meeting at the CPSU Central Committee between members of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau, not a single coordinated measure has been implemented.

This policy affects the behavior of the broad masses, conflicts constantly flare up in areas where the two peoples live together, people are prevented from working on grounds of nationality, schools are divided, a stone-throwing war is waged in the streets, hostages are taken, and people are killed.

The country's leadership has constantly sought ways out of the situation. After a difficult series of meetings between USSR Supreme Soviet deputies from Azerbaijan and Armenia at the end of January this year, the Special Administration Committee was formed at the mutual suggestion of the two republics as a temporary, compromise measure and was entrusted with all the functions of the oblast soviet executive committee [oblispolkom] and the party obkom.

There is no doubt, A.I. Volskiy continued, that the introduction of the special form of administration has created a situation capable of defusing the atmosphere. But a great deal has not worked out in practice. The documents on the special form of administration did the rounds of offices for more than 4 months, as a result of which they became entangled in such a large number of provisos that the positive principle of special administration was severely limited. I am not sure whether they would ever have surfaced at all if it had not been for Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, who forced them to be issued some time in May. The committee's status has still not been defined and there is no statute on it, which has given extremists grounds for calling it unconstitutional.

Granted, in its rights, on many issues the committee has been unable to implement what was intended, particularly in the economic and social spheres, although a lot of groundwork has been done which had never been done here before. But the main aim has been achieved: Mass slaughter has been prevented.

The situation in the region today has sharply exacerbated. As yet there is no question of compromises. The NKAO is essentially in a state of blockade, with both the Armenian and the Azerbaijani population suffering. Matters have reached the point where the situation with regard to foodstuffs, fuel, and medicines has become catastrophic.

While visiting the oblast, the commission of people's deputies set up by the USSR Supreme Soviet examined in depth the NKAO's problems and elucidated and took into account both sides' interests. However, one thing is worrying, the speaker noted. The atmosphere in both Azerbaijan and Armenia is being stoked up without waiting for the conclusions and proposals of the interethnic people's deputies. The goal is clear—to influence the commission's conclusions. Sessions and rallies are being feverishly held, there are rumors about insults to the nations and insults to sovereignty, and central organs and the Special Administration Committee and its members personally also come under fire. This preemptive campaign stoops to both insinuations and downright slander.

Here is an indicative fact. For all the confrontation between the hostile sides, their slogans and calls are virtually identical. For example, People's Front leaders at mass rallies and meetings held in Stepanakert last week could have been using carbon copies of what the Baku informals said when they held forth about the

unconstitutionality of the Special Administration Committee, the people's mistrust of it, the need to pull out the troops, and so on. This was said by many speakers at the extraordinary Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet session which has just been held. Both sides issue calls to create self-defense detachments to have republican armies, and so on. These actions are manipulated by carefully undercover forces possessing real power in both republics. I fully agree with the Baku City Soviet deputies who declared a week ago in an address published by the republic's newspapers: "We have in our republic, taking refuge beneath the NKAO question, a raging mafia with similar elements linked with it in a single chain, anti-Soviet and anticommunist groupings which have established contact with extremist nationalist groups operating in various regions of our country. We make no secret of the fact that we are on the threshold of events which could have grave catastrophic consequences."

A gloomy but realistic forecast. This is the Baku session's gloomiest forecast.

The most important point now is not to teach and lecture one another but to learn together. To get leaders, representatives of the intelligentsia, deputies, and maybe even reformists to sit down around the same table. It is absolutely necessary to be with the people so as to restore their calm. This cannot be left to careerists and political adventurists. Unfortunately, many bad advisers are arriving in the region and elsewhere from other regions. I do not wish to name them; in their ignorance of specific issues they only hinder the cause of reconciliation.

Concluding his speech, the Special Administration Committee chairman emphasized that it is necessary to use the force of party influence and authority to ensure that extremists lose their influence over the people. It is necessary to have patience, it is necessary to act with restraint and nurture the gains of perestroyka. We regard both peoples with profound respect and do our utmost to protect the interests of each of them. But the most decisive step must be taken, otherwise all this will smolder like a peat bog, ready to burst into flames at any moment.

The floor was then given to M.I. Nenashev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting. If we are to try and summarize all the recent worries and alarms, he said, and to single out the most important one among them, it will certainly be alarm for the party, for its prestige, for its combat ability and for trust in it. The paradox of our time is that the party is the initiator of revolutionary changes, and yet it is the party that is the main target of criticism and the main culprit, in the opinion of the most zealous reformers, behind today's difficulties and problems.

Pondering this paradox, you began to reflect. Maybe there is no paradox at all, maybe there is simply a natural phenomenon brought about by the very conditions of our unusual time, a phenomenon which we are still unable or unwilling to fully understand. We must thoroughly and soberly investigate all this without any emotions, without dramatizing the situation, as M.S. Gorbachev said in his report, so as not to scare ourselves, but also without underestimating anything, because the situation in the country is indeed exceptionally serious. Furthermore, it seems to me that today there really is more than enough criticism of the party. We mass media workers have certainly succeeded in this. But so far we are obviously still short of self-criticism. It seems to me that self-criticism has not been voiced in these last 2 days at our plenum, either.

However, when we all analyze the complex problems which really exist in our life today, when we try to work out the causes of the lag in the economy, education, and science, when we ponder the past, the present, and the future, we cannot but think of the prime cause. Why was the party unable to counter the processes of socialism's deformation? At sharp changes of direction, when it found the strength to bring the negative processes to light and put forward a positive program, matters were limited—and this happened on several occasions—to nothing more than changes at the top.

We all, the speaker went on, must also consider the extent to which these deformations and deviations from Leninist principles affected the party itself. I think that we Communists must be frank and realize that the present attitude toward the party and the decline of its prestige largely have their origins in its remote and recent past, and most of all its present. We all know that organizational methods are still largely based on administrative edict methods, on unquestioning obedience, and this does not strengthen our party. Its political prestige is not strengthened by the existing system of political agitation and propaganda. I wish to say this frankly, because our agitation and propaganda system, in many instances based on dogmatism and drum-beating methods, more often than not fails to persuade, fails to arouse interest, and in many respects annoys people. It would be simply wrong to fail to realize this.

If we take a look at chronology, I believe that perestroyka already has its own history and that we ought to turn to chronology and take a close look at how this history has developed. I believe that in the analyses of the situation which has taken shape an important landmark for us party members was the 19th Party Conference. Its role, its discussions, and the entire nature of its work were a revelation, an explosion of public activeness, and evoked tremendous confidence in the party and in perestroyka. Yet immediately after the conference, it seems to me, the old inertia characteristic of many of us set in again.

And strange though it may seem, the speaker said, it was precisely after the conference that the loss of party initiative began to emerge distinctly, for we in the party committees unhurriedly set about changing the structure and repairing our party house, while political life in many cases took its own course. And this, if you like, is the root of many of the shortcomings which we are witnessing. To

be frank, even now we lack self-criticism and profound understanding of the analyses of our internal party problems. Not once have we discussed this seriously, if you like, at a plenum yet. I am convinced that we lack understanding that the roots of the difficulties and shortcomings lie in the present forms and methods of party work.

I would like to make separate mention of a most complex matter relating to my present work—the ideological situation, which we must carefully investigate.

The ideological situation is indeed extremely complex today. Our times are characterized (and this too must be frankly admitted) by a certain weakening of party leadership of the press, radio, and television. And there is much truth in the criticism voiced by comrades here and at previous plenums. Why is this happening? In my opinion, it is happening because it is no longer possible to issue orders in the old way and to base work with the press on mindless obedience; it is no longer possible today, but we do not know how to exercise leadership in a new way, and, to be honest, are in no hurry to learn.

The weakening of party influence on the mass media at the present time has resulted, it seems to me, in the development in conditions of democratization and glasnost of a rather surprising situation, which—Soon for all us Communists. I would even say a paradoxical situation, whereby on the one hand—[illegible]mocratism and glasnost are displayed, and on the other hand there is a certain monopolization of public opinion. This has found (and continues to find) expression in the fact—I can see this clearly now in radio and television broadcasting—that a relatively small group of current affairs writers, journalists, and scientists actively holds forth on all problems. They largely beg the microphones and many pages of the press, they inform, they mold public opinion, and in many cases they themselves raise and then answer all the questions which concern us all.

We are indignant, we criticize this, yet we refuse to realize that this happens with our overt assistance. Why? Because, after all, this can be put down to the perfidy of the journalists, which would be easiest of all, and which is what we are doing. But we refuse to put it down to the fact that we ourselves are unwilling to become partners, unwilling to become participants in these polemics and debates—unwilling because we are not ready.

In my role as chairman of the State Committee for Radio and Television Broadcasting I periodically experience pressure from local level. Show how we are demonstrating, show how we are on strike. Practically never does anyone call to ask. Show that we have resumed work. Show examples of interesting work by pere-strovka.

Now, about another political lesson. I understand the sheer complexity of the times in which we are living, we are learning in these times, but I must frankly say that we are learning badly. Take our parliament, the Supreme Soviet, for instance. How did the polemics proceed there? The polemics did not merely concern specific candidates, they constantly splashed over into a whole range of problems—political, economic, and social problems. And who conducted the polemics? Comrades Gorbachev, Ryzhkov, and Lukyanov. And that's all. No one else took part in the polemics. Is this correct? Yet the Supreme Soviet includes chiefs of party Central Committee departments, and Central Committee secretaries are people's deputies. Why in 6 weeks did none of them find the time to engage in serious polemics? We complain about the loss of initiative, but we do little to translate these new political methods into practice.

The floor was taken by N.V. Gellert, machine operator on the state farm [sovkhoz] named for Amangeldy in the Kazakh SSR. Today, she said, we are discussing a question which cannot leave anyone indifferent. But this is precisely why I would like to refrain from emotions, because in the nationalities question emotions contribute least of all to a correct decision. What is needed here is calm arguments, a desire to understand the other side, and the ability to put oneself in its position.

It is true that there are many problems in our country, and they all have to be taken into account. One of the most urgent problems is the problem of deported peoples who have been deprived of their statehood for almost half a century. If today we are discussing the difficulties of the Soviet peoples who have their own republics, what about the position of the peoples who do not even have autonomy?

I have already had the opportunity to express my opinion that in order to lead a normal life every nation must have its own home, be in charge there, and be able [illegible] to resolve its problems by itself. Therefore I believe that above all we must, as swiftly as possible, ensure statehood for all the peoples who still do not have it, since without statehood their future is in question.

The pain of all these peoples is close to my heart and I understand it, but since I am most familiar with the situation and problems of the 2 million Soviet Germans I would like to dwell on them. Probably, few people in this hall know that this year sees the 225th anniversary of the arrival of the Soviet Germans' ancestors in the then-undeveloped lands of the Volga region at the invitation of the Russian state. In different times such an anniversary might have been marked by a great festival, but unfortunately, for half a century now the Soviet Germans have had neither national festivals nor any opportunity to mark them.

After the abolition in 1941 of their autonomous republic on the Volga and their deportation to Siberia and Kazakhstan, after the army labor camps into which all the adult population above 15-16 years of age was thrown and kept behind barbed wire, after long years under special resettlement regulations whose violation was punished with 20 years' forced labor, after years of all kinds of discrimination in the political, social, and

cultural life of the country, the Soviet Germans are currently in a position for which even critical would be too mild a description.

They are scattered throughout our huge country and do not have a single national school, secondary school, or VUZ. Most of them have lost their native language, and their culture has been virtually destroyed. Their position can be shown by several figures already cited in the press. One hundred times less native-language literature is produced for Soviet Germans than is the case for Kirghiz, 160 times less than for Latvians, and 320 times less than for Estonians. That is the position today of a people whose autonomous republic was a front-ranker before the war in both the economy and culture.

For 50 years Soviet Germans have not even had the opportunity to elect their own representatives to the country's supreme organs of power. If Germans are elected it is not as representatives of their own people but as representatives of territorial okrugs where Germans are never the majority.

The restoration of Soviet Germans' statehood, which they have been seeking for many years now, is thus the last chance for them to survive as a people. The need to solve this problem was stated in principle in the report. It was also mentioned, as is well known, at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet session. However, Soviet Germans are worried about the lack of specifics on this issue.

Just what, N.V. Gulkevich continued, worries the Germans? They are worried that people are not yet talking about restoring the autonomous republic but about the need for a phased solution to this issue. This means, as I understand it, the formation initially of a national raion, for instance. Then, as it is settled and takes shape, the creation of an autonomous oblast. And only later of an autonomous republic.

Of course, there is logic to this plan, and in a normal situation it could be considered correct. However, we have to bear in mind the exceptionally complex position in which the Germans find themselves today. They have been striving for so many years for complete rehabilitation, which they understand purely as the restoration of their autonomous republic. Their concerns, aspirations, and hopes have been ignored for so long that many people have already finally lost faith in justice ever being restored for them. If they are now offered a national raion or autonomous oblast instead of an autonomous republic it will arouse a sharp protest from the overwhelming majority of people.

Emigration by Soviet Germans has now reached unprecedented levels. This decision will force hundreds of thousands more working people to take desperate steps. Soviet Germans are raising the question unambiguously—there should be an immediate decision on the restoration of their autonomous republic. The restoration process, as was naturally to be gradual. At the same time a decision should be made to set up or restore national raions and rural soviets in places where there is currently a high concentration of Germans. I think that these expectations will be reflected in our plenum decisions.

The second thing worrying Soviet Germans, and no less than the form of their autonomy, is the timetable for adopting a decision on its restoration. It can definitely be said that all the timetables in this area have long since expired. This decision, in my view, cannot be postponed until next year. That is why I support the opinions about the need to adopt this decision at the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

I have one more proposal. The party platforms mentioned the creation of central national councils for peoples without their own statehood. In my view, this could be extended in a number of cases to those peoples who have their own autonomous formation but live dispersed throughout the country. As for the Germans, she continued, such a central council could considerably help the Supreme Soviet in preparing and resolving the question of the restoration of the German Autonomous Republic.

The last thing I would like to mention is the fate of those who were mobilized into the so-called worker army during the war. By the end of the war only half of them at the most were still alive. They have still not been given equal status with Great Patriotic War participants. Often even those Soviet Germans who were sent to the worker army from the front have still not been given the status of participant in the war. It is finally time to rectify any injustice committed against Soviet people.

A.A. Vlasenko, first secretary of Smolensk party obkom, was given the floor. The events of recent months, the speaker noted, have convincingly shown how topical the question being discussed at today's plenum is. The interethnic conflicts in the Transcaucasus and the open separatism in the Baltic republics, Moldavia, and other regions have exceedingly complicated the situation in the country and created a threat to the existence of our multinational state.

The question is whether it will remain a federation of free and equal Soviet republics, as conceived by Lenin, or whether national egoism will destroy our union.

History teaches that at major turning points cohesion and unity of action are more important than ever.

Today, the speaker continued, the party is armed with a constructive program for solving national problems. And the main thing is that we must now resolutely rebuff the forces whipping up nationalist hysteria and putting forward antihuman and blatantly anti-Soviet and antisocialist slogans. National egoism has already caused our peoples considerable grief. It has even reached the central oblasts of Russia. The inhabitants of Smolensk Oblast recently welcomed more than 2,000 Meskhetian Turk refugees from Uzbekistan. Their desperation and

suffering was painfully familiar to our people, particularly the older generation. Today their children are at school, while the adults have been given work and accommodation. And there have been no cases of their being called outsiders or migrants. Nobody has any doubt about their civil right to take part in the forthcoming elections. And it is not just a question of the centuries-old traditions of the kindness of the Russian people, who are always ready to extend the hand of fraternal aid to anyone in distress.

The tragedy in Fergana aroused among our people an angry protest against the actions taken by the nationalists and helped public awareness to understand the historical futility of bloody, strong-arm solutions to interethnic problems. No mistakes committed in the past entitle people to discriminate against small or large peoples. Today there are tens of millions of people in the country who do not live in the land of their forefathers. Even in our age-old Russian oblast there are 90 nationalities.

We cannot and should not redraw the map and engage in wholesale resettlement of peoples. Life dictates that we be wiser, move from confrontation to dialogue, and find a cure for new as well as old ills.

The political, economic, legal, and linguistic areas of the perestroyka of national relations have already been mentioned here. Without belittling their significance, I would like to draw your attention to the ideological aspect of this problem.

Our political lexicon contains the truly great and hallowed concept of "internationalism." It was through Soviet people's fraternal mutual assistance and mutual aid that historic victories were won. And the current economic slump has been particularly painful because of the deterioration in interethnic relations. Therefore the well conceived work of party organizations must be geared to international education. But where are we to find convincing arguments in defense of it? In life itself and in our own history, of course.

There are a great many examples of true fraternity and mutual assistance in every region of our country. Our oblast's working people have long had such ties with Belorussia, the Ukraine, Lithuania, and other republics, krays, and oblasts. Lithuanian and Smolensk land reclamation specialists have worked fruitfully on peace and harmony shoulder to shoulder for more than 15 years. A student international construction detachment comprising representatives of all the country's union republics and the hero cities has been in operation for 25 years now. They are the people who are constructing the city of Gagarin, the birthplace of our very own Yuriy Alekseyevich, the space pioneer. This kind of cooperation is a good school for international education. The speaker then dwelt on the problem of national languages. He said, in particular, that Mikhail Sergeyevich's report has already said that Soviet power received an extremely neglected "linguistic setup" from tsarism. I would add to this that, of the more than 100 languages, only 50 or so possessed a written language. Soviet scientists had to create alphabets for 90 languages which previously lacked a written language. The history of world culture can show no similar examples. As for the free functioning of the languages of all nationalities, so far as the party is concerned this is simply not an issue. Only the proposed solutions may be debatable.

The question of the advisability of deeming the language of the nationality which gave its name to a union or autonomous republic to be the state language falls within the competence of the republics themselves. Equality of languages and free choice of the language of instruction must be strictly preserved here. The Russian language has become the language of interethnic communication in our country. We are creating a rule-of-law state. It is well known that there is not a single state in the world without a state language. Without fail, they have one, two, or even more. Speaking about the importance of the Russian language, I would like to recall that in 1948, during the "cold war," Allen Dulles taught: You don't need the atom bomb to destroy the USSR, you only need to suggest to its peoples that they will be able to manage without knowing the Russian language. Economic, cultural, and other ties would be broken. The state would cease to exist. Circumstances insistently dictate—and I support the report's proposal on this—that the Russian language be enshrined in the constitution as the state language throughout the USSR's territory.

The linguistic rights of all peoples will be observed if both the republic languages and the Russian language have state status. Our state institutions have been compared increasingly frequently with those of the United States of late. That country is inhabited by 49 million people of German descent, 28 million Latin Americans, 10 million Italians, 8 million Poles, approximately 6 million Jews, and 750,000 Armenians. Despite that, they do not have any linguistic or federative problems. The state language is English.

In Vladimir Ilich Lenin's words, politics is the concentrated expression of economics. We undoubtedly need the appropriate economic conditions in order to harmonize interethnic relations. We are all pinning great hopes on regional economic accountability. But let us face up to the truth. Today every republic and every region have different starting conditions. If this is not taken into account, tomorrow we will once again discover a considerable gap between republics' socioeconomic development. And not only because some people work better and creatively, while others work less well and in the old way. Is it right that the country's largest republic—Russia—finds itself in conditions of financial, price, and economic discrimination? Its population, particularly in the Non-Chernozem Zone and in other regions, has a considerably poorer life and suffers from bad roads and the backwardness of the social sphere.

The representatives of the People's Fronts in the Baltic republics realize this perfectly well. Nevertheless, they

are laying claim to all conceivable and inconceivable territories. What is behind this? It is not hard to guess. The economic position of the Russian Federation, which invested considerable amounts of its own resources in these plants and factories, will be aggravated still further.

With regard to Smolensk Oblast, it is still in exceptionally complex conditions. This is in many respects linked with objective factors. We have not yet succeeded in overcoming the consequences of the last war, which resulted in the virtual total destruction and burning of cities and villages and economic ruin. The Smolensk area suffered the particularly bitter and totally irreparable loss of people. Approximately 600,000 people, or 1 in 3 inhabitants, died. Many towns were literally depopulated. We have not yet succeeded in restoring even half the prewar population of the oblast.

Rural depopulation is the main factor retarding the resolution of the food problem. The situation is aggravated by the extremely low level of capital investment. Today it is less than half the normative and lower by a factor of 4-5 than in the Baltic republics and Belorussia. Despite this complex situation, planning organs and the RSFSR Council of Ministers have set our oblast clearly overstated and quite unjustified volumes for deliveries of dairy and meat products to union republic stocks. For milk and meat they total 66 and 60 percent respectively of the overall procurements. Our frequent appeals to the republic's government and to the CPSU Central Committee have not met with support and understanding. We realize that we must resolve these questions primarily by enhancing the level of economic activity and building up the levels of production and sale of agricultural output, and on this basis improve the population's food supply. To this end, using the Ukrel method, the oblast has elaborated and is implementing a program for the revival of the Smolensk countryside. In the last 2 years of this 5-year plan 52 kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes will undergo comprehensive development and another 100 economic farms will do so in the 13th 5-Year Plan. Considerable funds and construction materials are needed to implement this program. We are seeking some of them at local level, earning money from voluntary work on Saturdays and Sundays, and approximately R2 million has even been collected from the population's personal savings. However, this task cannot be resolved at present without aid from the USSR Government.

The working people of the Smolensk region greeted with satisfaction the proposals aimed at enhancing the RSFSR's legal status and its state and national structure. Indeed, Russia needs its own state management organs, including administrative, economic, ideological, cultural, scientific, and other organs. We deem it necessary to form an RSFSR party organization and to elect a Central Committee.

In conclusion, the speaker said: In view of the decision to convene the 28th CPSU Congress, I regard it as inadvisable to hold plenums with reports by party committees. Something else is considerably more important now: focusing party organizations' attention on resolving socioeconomic questions, on preparing for the elections, and on fulfilling the decisions that are adopted by the present Central Committee Plenum.

M Yu Yusupov, first secretary of the Dagestan CPSU Obkom, mounted the rostrum. Saying that never before since Lenin have the Soviet Union's peoples enjoyed such democratic opportunities for national choice as they have received in conditions of perestroyka, he noted: The question is whether we have enough political and moral culture not to succumb to the euphoria of "national freedom" and to arrive at a genuine internationalism consciously realized and filtered through the national being of each people and each person. Ultimately this may be one of the main conditions ensuring that all our country's peoples, regardless of their size and historical past, take their worthy place among the most advanced and civilized nations of the modern world.

Therefore the tenets expressed in M S Gorbachev's report regarding the indivisible unity of the national rebirth and the international consolidation of our country's peoples, in our view, can form the basis for the plenum's decisions and future practical work. This understanding was also the determining factor during the discussion by Dagestan's Communists and working people of the draft CPSU platform on the nationalities question.

The speaker went on to make certain remarks and proposals on the question under discussion. While fully supporting the CPSU platform's principled idea of granting greater autonomy and freedom to the union republics, he noted that he thinks that the radical renewal of nationalities policy and interethnic relations is possible only via the granting of equally real rights to all autonomous republics as well. We are sometimes accustomed to autonomous republics having a second-rate status, the speaker said. The draft platform also suffers from this.

In this connection he proposed that the platform clearly single out basic principles making it possible to utilize with greater effectiveness the republics' national potential and the advantages of the federative association; he dwell on overcoming the reasons giving rise to uneven-ness in the development of republics and regions; and he noted that there is also a need for a mechanism making it possible to overcome the lag of some republics behind others. The lack of such a mechanism tends, in particular, to stimulate unjustified, expensive flows of migration inside and outside the republic. And this, in turn, may be the cause of the emergence of new zones of social and national tension.

As a result of these and other objective factors, M Yu Yusupov said, Dagestanis have found themselves on the territory of neighboring republics and RSFSR krays and oblasts. Historically, representatives of dozens of nationalities live together with Dagestanis on the territory of

the autonomous republic. It is primarily important for everyone to proceed from the reality in which they find themselves and to create the maximum conditions for the national cultural development of all those who live alongside. Instead of this, the speaker noted, in some places there is a clear policy of driving people out of one territory and into another and an indifferent attitude toward their fate and needs. Such activity has nothing in common with internationalism and general human values. It is important to place a reliable legal barrier in its path. I think that from the moral viewpoint it insults above all the national dignity and honor of the people on whose territory the representatives of other nationalities live.

Touching on the problem of implementing real measures to expedite the development of productive forces and enhance the republic's role in the all-union division of labor, M.Yu. Yusupov said that work is under way in Dagestan to create a model of socioeconomic development capable of ensuring the fuller use of manpower resources and natural potential, including the rich hydroelectric power reserves and other potential. He also mentioned the problems inherited as a result of the lawlessness and distortions of nationalities policy that took place during the personality cult years. Along with other peoples, the Chechens resident on Dagestan were subjected to repression and resettlement from their territories during the war years. Representatives of other nationalities of the republic were forced to resettle in their area.

These are highly complex questions. It is important to resolve them in such a way as to prevent infringement of any party's interests.

The draft party platform, the speaker went on to declare, orients us toward preserving the identity of each people as a unique historical formation and implementing their potential spiritual and moral capacities and social experience. The attractiveness of the concept of nationalities policy that is under discussion lies in this. The state of the national cultural development of Dagestan's peoples has also been seen in a new way in the light of the ideas of perestroyka and democratization. As is well known, national nihilism regarding culture and language used often to be presented as internationalism. The study of native languages was in many respects purely formal. But today work to strengthen the material and technical base for the proper study of national languages and to train teaching cadres has begun to be carried out. Eleven languages are studied in the republic's schools. This year specialist academics have created alphabets for a further three languages of the indigenous peoples. Much work still lies ahead. But people in Dagestan are convinced that it is possible and necessary to organize normal study of native languages and to enhance their functional status without infringing the role and status of the Russian language, which is an irreplaceable means of interethnic communication. They can and must develop together. We cannot understand, M.Yu. Yusupov noted, why emotions have suddenly prevailed in a number of places during consideration of such an important question and why haste is being shown instead of rational analysis of the problem in the light of people's real interests.

Speaking of the nations' spiritual development, he stressed the importance of the fact that all representatives of a particular nationality, including those who by force of circumstances in their lives have been settled on different territories together with other peoples, are the bearers of its cultural and linguistic traditions. In Dagestan every tenth family is ethnically mixed and every fourth marriage contracted in the cities is also ethnically mixed.

As the report has already said, in the country over 60 million people live outside their own national-territorial formations. Here it is impossible to draw a line between the nations, it would in no way be justified from the viewpoint of the peoples' social and spiritual progress. That is why the idea of a party platform on the creation of national-cultural centers in places where representatives of particular nationalities live together is close to them.

Lenin's 1921 letter to the Communists of the Caucasus bequeathed to us friendship and mutual understanding. Today it is important to display courage and good will to overcome existing difficulties and worthily fulfill the behests of the great Lenin regarding the creation of a model of ethnic peace in the Caucasus. Concluding his speech, the speaker said that the implementation of the fundamental provisions of the nationalities policy platform will mean making the utmost effort to normalize the interethnic situation. Here, he noted, we cannot fail also to see that those who are concerned for their own selfish ambitions interests want to use the natural growth of national self-awareness generated by perestroyka. Under these conditions Communists are called on to adopt a clear internationalist stance and to rebuff all those who want to abuse people's sacred feelings.

In resolving interethnic problems we have begun recently to rely increasingly actively on authoritative people, on veterans, on the accumulated experience of joint life on the territory of Dagestan of tens of peoples who in their many centuries of history have known no enmity or discord among themselves.

Centuries of experience, M.Yu. Yusupov said, have confirmed the vitality of the folk saying that the world rests on friendship. It is particularly necessary for us to remember this now at a crucial time in Soviet society's revolutionary renewal.

A.R.Kh. Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, mounted the rostrum.

It may be said without exaggeration that without a new nationalities policy there can be no success in the reform of the political system or in economic transformations, the speaker said.

As a whole the CPSU's platform reflects the state of affairs which really exists and gives a correct idea with regard to the main points. The draft has been actively discussed in our republic. I should like to mention some of the most important remarks and proposals voiced by our Communists and the republic's working people.

The draft points out in particular that the definitive decision on vexed issues between the union republics and the autonomous formations which belong to them is made by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. We are suggesting that it be specified in principle that this cannot be extended to territorial questions, wherever they may arise. Only on condition that the principle of the republics' sovereignty is observed will this provision work to strengthen the federation of the USSR. We fully share M.S. Gorbachev's statement regarding the impermissibility of reserving borders. Encroachment on the territorial integrity of a union republic should be described as a state crime. Perhaps we should enshrine this principle in legislation and reflect this provision in the CPSU platform.

The Central Committee plenum must also express itself firmly and clearly against attempts to change the laws to benefit narrow national aspirations and seek advantages for one people at the expense of others, or especially at the expense of the interests of the entire country. It seems to us that we must also speak clearly on a question like a nation's right to independence. As is well known, the nation as a whole, not individual parts of it, possesses this right. The principle of self-determination cannot be reduced merely to the right to secession, it also includes the expansion of the potential for self-management and the enjoyment of all benefits of the federation and consequently responsibility to its members.

In defining its nationalities policy at the present stage our party is essentially completing the elaboration of the concept of perestroyka which organically unites its three main parts—political reform, economic reform, and an updated nationalities policy. The integral concept of perestroyka will make it possible to define clearly the ultimate goals and appearance of the society toward which we are striving. But that is not enough. It is particularly important to designate the specific stages, methods, and sequence of actions.

The speaker then noted that nationalities processes in Azerbaijan are proceeding in a contradictory and complex manner. They have been affected, as they have throughout the country as a whole, by the burden of the multiplicity of unresolved problems which have accumulated over the decades, the 0.5 million jobs shortfall, the distortions in the development of the national economy, the neglect of the social sphere, the alienation of the broad masses from vigorous political activity, distortions in cadres policy, the flouting of social justice. All this has formed a very strong field of social tension, which the antiperestroyka forces have not failed to use for dirty purposes. The Karabakh drama has been continuing for about 2 years. A number of speakers have touched on this subject. A.I. Vedikhi also mentioned it. Of course, I have something to say on the questions he raised. I should merely like to stress that he could probably have been more self-critical and objective. After all, he was the one who said that on the period of the activity of the Special Administration Committee, which he heads, the situation on the NKAO has become much worse.

The conflict, A.-R.Sh. Vezirov said, has become so protracted primarily because all this time the separatist nationalist forces have been actively supported by some circles in Armenia and by the Armenian diaspora while, on the other hand, our nationalist forces are displaying an unjustified reluctance for compromise.

All this is making our work incredibly more difficult and complicated and is undermining the efforts aimed at normalizing mutual relations between the two peoples. Nationalist passions are being inflamed and intolerance is growing.

We categorically denounce the road blockades and what is being done against the neighboring republic. But I should not like people to form the impression that this is taking place solely through the fault of one side. And, of course, I should like to hear a denunciation and the readiness to take similar actions from our Armenian comrades. Everything must be done together.

We have done and will continue to do everything within our power to prevent rampant passions on interethnic grounds. People who have committed unlawful actions have been punished. But I would also like to declare the following. One of the main causes of the unsanctioned rallies and strikes which took place in Baku last November and in the last few days is the fact that many people demand an answer to the question: Why is interference in a sovereign republic's internal affairs allowed? We are unable to explain to people why the entire Azerbaijani population has been expelled from Armenia, why conditions for its return are not being created, and why there has been no compensation for the damage it has suffered to this day. We are asked why there has been no appraisal of the stance of the Communists who allowed all this to happen.

Way back in February 1988 the CPSU Central Committee Politburo unambiguously declared the impermissibility of any changes in the Azerbaijan SSR's national-territorial structure. This position was also confirmed at the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium's sitting in July last year. And if everyone had been guided by these principled directives, it might have been possible to avoid such tragic consequences. Here I would like to especially emphasize the following thought. For as long as the inertia of old approaches remains in operation, it is impossible to put all hopes on all questions being resolved by the center alone. Unfortunately, for a long time we were taught that this was the case. Frankly speaking, we ourselves must bear primary responsibility for the solution of all questions. Especially as we are

moving toward full sovereignty, and sovereignty means not only rights but also lofty responsibility. This is why the republic's Supreme Soviet, proceeding from the premise that the Special Administration Committee has not lived up to the hopes associated with it, deemed it necessary to petition the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium for the committee's abolition.

We perceive the solution to the NKAO problem only within a constitutional framework, including via the creation of conditions for ensuring elections and for a resumption of activity by party and soviet organs. The republic guarantees the safety of all citizens in the oblast and the satisfaction of their requirements in the economic, social, and cultural spheres, and we will of course show concern to ensure that the practice which led to these events never recurs.

We, the speaker went on, wholeheartedly welcomed yesterday's address by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to the leaderships and peoples of Azerbaijan and Armenia asking them not to allow rampant passions to call a halt, and to display wisdom and self-possession. We will not deviate from this path; we will not allow emotions to drown reason. We call on people to decisively disassociate themselves from dark forces, to resolve practical questions together step by step, and to untie the knots of contradictions. This is not an easy path, but we must travel it together.

Comrades! The report and the debate speeches prove that a well organized system for the management of nationalities processes must be created in the country. It must embrace the party, which elaborates the strategy of nationalities policy; the soviets, through which this policy is implemented by means of laws and practical actions; and the sphere of ideological and theoretical activity.

I feel that there is a pressing need to create not just a commission but actually a special CPSU Central Committee Department for Interethnic Relations headed by a Central Committee secretary.

There is something else I must say. At meetings in this hall one hears complaints about blunders, the economy's lag, and the decline of the party's prestige. It is said that we're going in the wrong direction. Of course, by no means everything is running smoothly in our country. But the country is living, following its chosen path, maybe not at the pace we would like, but we are certainly not standing still.

Our republic, for example, despite all the difficulties which I mentioned, has managed to achieve some progress in the implementation of priority programs which have enjoyed the people's support and approval. The profits plan has been overfulfilled by the national economy as a whole. The number of loss-making enterprises has been halved in one year. A lot of housing is under construction. Even now, before the transition to self-financing, Azerbaijan ensures its budget revenues without any union subsidies. Rural working people, despite the drought, fulfilled the plan for vegetable deliveries to all-union stocks. We have already delivered more than one-half of the planned harvest quantities of cotton, grapes, and other crops, and this is much more than last year. All this goes to boost the prestige of the republic's party organization. Its ranks are swelling, the nucleus of workers is strengthening. But much more still remains to be done, and we are orienting the republic's Communists and all working people in this direction.

We fully agree with the platform's tenet about the danger of the party dividing along national lines. We must face up to the truth. The nationalism which has spread among Communists poses a major danger for the party today. Internationalism is the ideological creed of party members. The party's prestige and its vanguard role in perestroyka depend on the consistent and persistent implementation of the party's renewed nationalities policy and the consolidation of its inherent internationalist line.

The floor was taken by A. M. Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajik Communist Party Central Committee. A frank and constructive discussion on interethnic relations in our country and the ways to solve the problems accumulated in this sphere, he noted, has gone on for several months now. But it became especially specific and objective following the publication of the draft CPSU platform on the party's nationalities policy in present-day conditions.

All aspects of this fundamental document were actively and keenly discussed also in our republic, because the problems stemming from various still unsolved aspects of the nationalities question which have urgently arisen recently in various regions of the country also exist to varying degrees in our own republic and originate from the republic's economic and social position.

Everyone knows that labor resources finding no employment in the social production sphere are increasing at a very fast pace in Tajikistan, as in other Central Asian republics. They already amount to more than 200,000 people. In this context the question of siting cotton processing and light industry enterprises and other labor-intensive production units in the republic has been repeatedly raised with the country's planning organs. As a rule, however, this was not supported by union organs. This is what happened with the decision to build a series of spinning and weaving enterprises, as envisaged by the basic guidelines for the economic and social development of the USSR in previous 5-year plan periods, for 1986-1990, and for the period through the year 2000. To this day, 90 percent of the cotton fiber produced is shipped out of the republic. Furthermore, the producers of raw cotton, who are engaged in hard and exhausting labor, receive payment which is miserly by today's standards. The price review is taking too long.

All this arouses dissatisfaction among the population and causes fresh problems which often acquire an interethnic overtone. The evening up of initial conditions for

the republic's transition to the principles of self-management and self-financing is one of the most acute problems.

The expected scale of the involvement in the national economic sphere of the rapidly increasing labor resources of Tajikistan and all Central Asia is so large that a general state program for the area is simply indispensable. Such a program should envisage the training of skilled cadres for newly created enterprises at the local level. We believe that there could be various management systems at the local level, and their formation should take place on the basis of the republic's real conditions and with greater economic interest for local soviets in developing union enterprises.

The draft CPSU platform quite rightly talks about restoring justice for repressed peoples, the speaker continued. However, in our view, deformations in solving the nationalities issue were reflected not only in the deportation of whole peoples, mass reprisals, and the ignoring of economic interests. Voluntarism and mistakes were committed in defining the national territorial boundaries of both union and autonomous formations. This, of course, should not be seen as a demand to revise boundaries. But we should not dodge the questions raised by life itself. I am thinking of the resolution of issues connected with the fullest satisfaction of the spiritual, linguistic, cultural, and other needs of people living outside their national-territorial formations.

The republic has created and will continue to create all the necessary conditions for the successful development of the language and culture of Uzbeks, Kirghiz, Turkmens, and other nationalities living in Tajikistan. To that end the utmost use will be made of opportunities for creating national-territorial rayons and rural and settlement soviets in areas where there is a high concentration of representatives of certain nationalities.

The speaker touched on the results of national-territorial demarcation and the clarification of borders associated with it. This is very important for Tajikistan, since 93 percent of the republic's territory is made up of mountains, and there are only 0.11 hectares per person. For some reason, the speaker noted, the central authorities often avoid examining such matters, leaving the resolution of any friction that arises to the local authorities.

The speech touched on the following question. Some Tajiks living in Uzbekistan were once entered in their passports as Uzbeks. There are many requests from them for their actual nationality to be restored on their passports. But this is the exclusive prerogative of central organs.

A very important point is that the draft platform raised from a position of perestroyka the question of the CPSU's role and place in the conditions in which our federation is being filled with real political and economic content. We wholly support the conclusion that it is fundamentally unacceptable for the CPSU to be split along national lines, the speaker said. The party has been and should remain international in make-up, ideologically and organizationally united, and with a common program and statutes.

At the same time, the expansion of union republic Communist Parties' rights, the retreat from daily tutelage and patronage on current issues, and the independent resolution of the main issues of party life as regards cadre, financial, and economic matters, up to and including the adoption of political documents in the spirit of the CPSU program, will result in a real and substantial increase in the authority of union republic Communist Parties, enhance their leaders' responsibility for the decisions they make, and enrich the party with new approaches in the implementation of the tasks of society's revolutionary renewal.

During the preparations for this plenum numerous meetings were held in Tajikistan with working people and the republic's Communists. One of the questions heard very frequently at these meetings related to ensuring representation for nations and ethnic groups among the top components of party, state, and economic administration. This was mentioned at the 19th All-Union Party Conference.

In the speaker's opinion, no notable improvements have been seen in this area. Tajikistan has in practice been virtually unrepresented or poorly represented in the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee, central soviet, trade union, and All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League [Komsomol] organs, foreign missions, union law-enforcement organs, and so forth. The republic's working people assess all this as insufficient attention toward the republic's cadres. It is time, the speaker said, to create real conditions to ensure proper representation for nations and ethnic groups in all components of the country's management organs while, needless to say, taking account of people's businesslike and professional qualities.

Talking about measures to improve interethnic relations, the speaker called for radical changes in all work for the international education of the masses, particularly young people. Distortions in nationalities policy have affected this sphere very severely. Sloganeering, window dressing, and short-term campaigns have severely damaged the cause of international patriotic education. Owing to shortcomings in ideological work the growth in national self-awareness has led in places to an intensification of nationalist sentiments and a devaluation of socialist moral values.

Learning lessons from the mistakes of the past, Tajikistan's party organs are striving to fundamentally restructure obsolete forms and methods of work for the population's international education. All the accumulated and urgent problems of our federative state, the speaker said, can and should be resolved through the revolutionary renewal of Soviet society without violating our union's integrity.

Recently there has been tension on nationalities questions in virtually all republics, the speaker said in conclusion. In order to resolve these questions better and more effectively we need one condition—we must have more trust in each other. I considered it necessary to say this because this evidence of a certain lack of trust can be seen very often in our lives and at this plenum. It is particularly noticeable when we are discussing events in the Baltic. For instance, he said, I am sure that my comrades will be able to cope with the situation and will resolve their questions within the framework of our union. The feelings of a united family and a united national complex should not leave us for a minute. We should ensure overall happiness in our common home together through the joint efforts of the entire Soviet people.

D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, then took the floor. Noting that M.S. Gorbachev's report and the draft party platform are of immense political importance, the speaker said that the Armed Forces support the party's policy. The Communists in the Army and Navy approve of the proposal on convening the next 28th CPSU Congress. Army and Navy party organizations are fully determined to use the preparation for the congress to galvanize all intraparty life, to rally the Communists, and to strengthen party influence on all aspects of military life and activity.

Our Army is a part of the people. V.I. Lenin and the Bolshevik Party created it as an army of the friendship and brotherhood of the peoples. Internationalism, fused as one with Soviet patriotism, even today determines the spirit of our Army and the entire tenor of its life and activity. Representatives of all the Soviet peoples serve in its ranks. As a rule there are 90-95 nationalities in military districts, 40-50 in divisions, and up to 30 in units and on ships.

These statistics are instructive in their own right. But, as you will appreciate, behind them stand all the problems which are typical of the present stage of national development and interethnic relations in our country. It is impossible not to see that certain negative phenomena which have arisen in a number of republics have started to penetrate into soldiers' barracks and sailors' quarters. This is also manifested in instances of national egoism and conceit on the part of individual servicemen, and ethnically motivated cliquishness. Instances of draft dodging by certain draftees have occurred which are unprecedented and are politically, socially, and morally alien to our system and to the very idea of defending the socialist fatherland. Instances of so-called nonregulation relations are increasingly frequently assuming ethnic overtones.

All this is an echo of the far-from-constructive processes which nationalistic, separatist, and extremist forces have succeeded in launching in a number of the country's regions. These forces are attempting to speculate on the indeed complex and acute ethnic problems. They have been quite successful in exploiting for their own ends the new moral and political atmosphere created by the party in society, and the climate of openness and democratism, in order to satisfy their political ambitions. Not having been duly rebuffed, and not disdaining lies, slander, and the incitement of base passions, they are trying to impose on thousands and thousands of people—and sometimes not unsuccessfully—slogans that are full of enmity and hatred for socialism, the party, and the Armed Forces.

An unhealthy atmosphere has taken shape around the military cantonments of a number of military units stationed in the Baltic region, the Transcaucasus, and certain other regions of the country. Demands, accompanied by cynical insults, for the withdrawal of large units and units to the territory of the Russian Federation have become commonplace. Soviet servicemen are being labeled occupiers. The urge to encroach upon their personal dignity and to inflict moral and physical abuse has become systematic in some places. Instances of discrimination in the granting of housing and residence permits for the families of servicemen and in job placement have become widespread. Attempts are being made to restrict or even totally rescind the right of servicemen to elect people to the organs of power or to be elected themselves. All this is accompanied by attempts—including with the aid of local and sometimes certain central mass media—to shape in the public's mind a negative attitude toward the Army, toward military service, and toward the military profession itself. Of course, we are not talking about the criticism of shortcomings and negative phenomena which exist in the Army and which need to be extirpated. Such criticism is justifiable and we are all for it. I am talking about something else: the overtly prejudiced coverage of the history, life, and activity of the Armed Forces, and the distortion of their place and role in society, in perestroyka.

All this offends those who have dedicated their life to military service, who honorably discharge their difficult military duty, and it evokes legitimate indignation in them. And we have no right to underestimate the uneasiness of people who bear arms. In some places passions are very seriously inflamed. Many officers and ensigns serving, for example, in Lithuania are stating bluntly that the intolerable situation which has been created on the grounds of the deliberate exacerbation of interethnic relations is perturbing them today far more even than their poorly organized day-to-day existence and the lack of housing—and, as we know, in certain units located in this republic more than half the families have no housing.

This is acquiring a particular sociopolitical coloration as a result of the fact that local party, soviet, and law-enforcement organs are sometimes adopting the position of detached observers in respect of negative phenomena and facts. In a number of areas communication between these organs and the commanders, political organs, and party organizations of troop units and large units is being weakened and even curtailed.

Recently there have been increasingly overt calls for our Army to be divided up into national compartments. Ultimatum-type demands for the creation of national troop formations and for military service by individuals of the indigenous nationality exclusively on the territories of their own republics. These calls are being made by the leaders of the people's fronts of Latvia, Estonia, and Georgia, Lithuania's "Sajudis," and a number of other movements. Indeed, yesterday Comrade Gumbaridze also submitted such a proposal. Yet at the same time he said that the representatives of many nationalities live on the territory of Georgia. Does this mean that it is necessary to create many armies; also, does it mean that every aul [Caucasian mountain village] must have its own army?

I would like to recall that at the dawning of Soviet power, when substantiating the need for the unity of the Soviet republics for defense purposes, V.I. Lenin emphasized the vital importance of the cohesion of all military forces in the mighty international Red Army. "Not a single Soviet republic taken individually," he said, "can regard itself as secure against economic exhaustion and military devastation." As before, these Leninist tenets retain their topicality today, too.

The conclusion drawn by the 19th All-Union Party Conference that imperialist sources of aggression and war have not disappeared and that guarantees of the irreversibility of the incipient positive processes have not taken shape is based on a profound analysis and critical assessment of the contemporary scene and trends. The desire of the U.S. military-political leadership to retain military strength as the chief instrument of U.S. foreign policy is abundantly clear from the documents of the U.S. Congress and the Pentagon concerning the fiscal 1990-1991 military budget and the military building programs for the 1990-1994 fiscal years. The utterances of U.S. President G. Bush, FRG Chancellor H. Kohl, and certain NATO military leaders testify to the North Atlantic bloc's adherence to the deterrence strategy, a deterrence addressed primarily to the Soviet Union and its allies.

The internationalization of the life and activities of the Armed Forces of the military-political bloc opposing us is enhancing their power. The question arises: For what, with what aim is this being done? For we have stated officially that we will never start a war and will not be the first to use nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, intensive war preparations are under way in the West. We fully support the party line of deepening the process of perestroyka of détente and disarmament. At the same time we do not have the right to forget 1941. We cannot allow it to be repeated.

All this obligates us to possess not only a sufficient but also an unconditionally reliable defense and combat-ready armed forces both for our country and the Warsaw Pact as a whole. It is not to be doubted that a rule-of-law state must possess a rule-of-law army. Clearly, in the interests of maintaining our army as an international force we should legislatively determine each republic's contribution to defense building in line with its potentials. In this connection I propose that point five of the section "How To Restructure the Soviet Federation and Make It a Full-Blooded Federation" be amplified and brought into line with Article 31 of our present USSR Constitution, which says: "The defense of the Soviet fatherland is among the state's most important functions and is the affair of the entire people." It is necessary to display effective concern for the study of the Russian language in the union republics. It is the language of interethnic communication in our country. In the army and the navy all instruction and education is conducted only in this language, and ignorance or poor knowledge of it creates considerable difficulties in mastering weaponry and equipment, the operational coordination of subunits, and the maintenance of the requisite level of combat readiness. Meanwhile, last year the number of draftees without Russian in practical terms exceeded 125,000 men. This is 12 times more than 20 years ago. An alarming trend!

The successful realization of the international principle in defense building and in the development and training of the Armed Forces depends directly on the close interaction of army and navy command and political organs with local party and soviet organs, and with the commissions and working groups on interethnic relations established under them. Above all else this relates to the solution of the tasks of replenishing the officer corps with ethnic cadres, training young people for military service, and the military-patriotic education of the people. Life demands the precise definition in the law on defense now under elaboration of our Army's special status, of the ensuring of its social protection as a Union institution at state level. An unambiguous answer must be given to the question of the Army's function, its involvement in the solution of internal tasks and problems must be regulated.

V.G.A. Yeliseyev, first secretary of Kabardino-Balkar CPSU Obkom, took the floor.

The working people of Kabardino-Balkaria, he said, ardently support the CPSU platform on the nationalities question. This document and the provisions and conclusions set out in M.S. Gorbachev's report can quite justifiably form the basis of a stable nationalities policy for the party and Soviet Government.

There are members of more than 90 nationalities, mainly Kabardins, Balkars, and Russians, living in Kabardino-Balkaria at the moment. Throughout the years of Soviet power the republic's population has been living and working as a united, harmonious family. But the interethnic tension in a number of regions of the country is to some extent being communicated to it too. The fact that in the autonomous republic, as in other regions of the country, many serious and urgent problems have accumulated is having a certain adverse effect on the social atmosphere. Above all there is the question of the study of national languages and history, and the development

of culture, good traditions, and customs. Questions concerning the rehabilitation of Balkar people, which have not been entirely resolved, and the delay on the solution of the ethnic problems of the Volga Germans, Meskhetian Turks, and Crimean Tatars, a large number of whom live in Kabardino-Balkaria, are causing some tension.

The oblast party organization, the speaker continued, is taking steps to tackle our interethnic issues promptly and more fully. This work is much more active at the moment in connection with the discussion of the CPSU draft platform. At the same time, during the discussion of the draft platform Communists and working people in the republic have made a number of suggestions. Dwelling on certain provisions, the speaker said, in particular, that a very important provision in the sphere of the nationalities question and interethnic relations is the creation not only of equal rights, as envisaged by the CPSU platform, but also equal opportunities for each republic and each nation.

At the moment there are considerable differences between union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, and other national territorial formations. They also exist between national ethnic groups within national-state and territorial formations.

They are differences not only on trivial questions, but on a whole range of important areas, including the siting of production forces, per capita income, provision of housing and municipal services, the level of education, medical services, and the state of the social infrastructure as a whole. Unfortunately, this is perceived by people primarily as national injustice, which often leads to interethnic tension.

The conclusion from this is that only on the basis of the establishment of real equal opportunities for the peoples' development, above all socioeconomic development, is it possible to eliminate and prevent the majority of the contradictions that occur today in the development of nations and in interethnic relations. The tasks of implementing this provision should, in our view, be more clearly reflected in the CPSU platform. In particular, it would be advisable for the new USSR Constitution to give autonomous republics the right to make the final decision on a number of economic, social, political, cultural, language, and ecological problems.

We support, the speaker said, the addendum to the CPSU draft platform to the effect that the whole range of questions connected with such a delicate sphere as Soviet autonomy should be revealed in a special all-union law on Soviet autonomy at the new historical stage of its development. It is difficult to implement the CPSU Central Committee provision and expand and strengthen the rights of autonomous entities, particularly in the economic sphere, based on regional economic accountability, without clearly distinguishing between the property of the autonomous entities and that of union republican organs and without a well thought-out mechanism for the distribution of products produced in the region. The simple transfer of management functions to the autonomous republics will not resolve the problem of increasing their commitment to improving the end results of economic activity. In this connection, the speech touched on budget legislation questions.

Language problems occupy a special place among nationalities issues. The problem of improving language policy at the present stage [sentence as published]. The knot of problems of interethnic relations cannot be untied without restoring the role and prestige of native languages in the life of society. No one has any doubt today that the general line of language policy for the foreseeable future is the development of bilingualism, both national-Russian and Russian-national. At the same time, there is an increasing need to step up work to rehabilitate national languages, particularly where they have been relegated mainly to the domestic sphere. Therefore, the speaker believes, it is absolutely right to propose the adoption of a special law on the free development and equal use of the languages of other USSR peoples. The rehabilitation of native languages is connected with the revival and further development of ethnic schools, particularly the 1st through 4th grades, in which, clearly, it is expedient to organize teaching only in native languages, with the future study of them as subjects in subsequent years. But I would like to stress once again that the study of Russian as the language of interethnic communication should be compulsory. Otherwise we will create a very difficult future for young nationals.

A mechanism of day-to-day management is needed to ensure that nationalities questions are systematically developed as part of the perestroyka strategy. The speaker fully supported the provisions of the report and CPSU platform on the need to create in the country a harmonious organizational structure for managing the development of interethnic relations. In the economic sphere regional economic accountability, ensuring that the economic interests of national republics and national-territorial formations are woven into the state-wide economic organism and the economic reform that is being conducted in the country, will be a most important component of this mechanism.

In the state-law sphere you could have this mechanism, as in the legislative sphere, in the form of chambers of nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and union and autonomous republics, with the relevant commissions. At the level of autonomous oblasts and territorial organs of power it would be in the form of a commission on interethnic relations, and, in the sphere of executive power, in the form of state committee on questions of the development of nations and refinement of interethnic relations, with the relevant departments in union and autonomous republics and other national formations. It would be advisable, in our view, to revive the permanent missions of the relevant nations, autonomous entities and national-territorial formations to union republic Councils of Ministers.

In the opinion of many of the republic's Communists, serious changes should be made to the structure of party organs with a view to strengthening party influence on the development of interethnic processes. It is proposed to create in the party Central Committee, the union republic Communist Party Central Committees, and party kray committees [kraykoms] and oblasts full-blown departments which could concentrate in their hands all the party's current work on nationalities problems. The work of this entire system as a whole and of its individual structural components would be more effective given good scientific support, which at present is unfortunately lacking in the country.

Before departing for the plenum, the speaker said, I met with old Communists. They urgently asked me to convey to the CPSU Central Committee and M.S. Gorbachev a request to take all necessary measures to strengthen the unity and friendship of our country's nations and ethnic groups. They have always been and remain the main factor in our motherland's might and a condition without which the further development of our multinational state is inconceivable. Today we cannot allow our party to be dragged off onto national compartments. The CPSU's strength lies in its unity, therefore the task of all Communists is to strengthen this unity and protect it from the encroachments of those who value narrow national interests more than statewide, partywide interests.

B.I. Korsunskiy, first secretary of the Jewish Autonomous Oblast CPSU Obkom, mounted the rostrum.

As the Communists and working people of the Jewish Autonomous Oblast see it, he said, perestroyka in the sphere of national relations means the assertion in life of real equality of rights and really equal responsibility of the peoples, irrespective of their size, for the progress of their republics, oblasts, and okrugs and for the general progress of our Soviet federation. This is precisely how working people have greeted yesterday's report by M.S. Gorbachev. It is well known that the desire for national homogeneity has always been utopian and reactionary, all the more so in contemporary conditions, the speaker continued. Today any large collective, not to mention oblast, kray, or republic, is multinational. Cogent evidence of this is provided by our oblast, where people of more than 90 nationalities live. In its 55-year history we have never come up against manifestations of national friction and grievances.

It is a different matter that the history of our oblast mirrored all the defects of the former nationalities policy. The repressions, the artificially stimulated struggle against cosmopolitanism, and the notorious "doctors' case" caused serious damage to its development. A decline in the emerging specific national nature of the oblast and in Jewish culture as a whole began in those years. It is worrying that the proportion of Jews among the oblast's population is decreasing. Of course, it is possible to speak of natural assimilation, but the crux of the matter does not lie in that. It lies in the fact that many socioeconomic problems remain unsolved, including paramount problems, local housing, health care, in short, the entire complex of the social sphere. As everywhere in the country, we have a number of difficulties in implementing the population's national cultural demands. The speaker went on to dwell on the measures that are now being taken in the oblast to rectify the situation. In particular, he noted that proposals for the balanced comprehensive development of the economy and the social sphere have been submitted to the country's government. Their implementation will make it possible to create a good scientific and technical potential and to improve people's living conditions. However, the USSR and RSFSR State Planning Committees, ministries, and departments are delaying the examination of these proposals.

The USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification is simply not taking effective measures to step up the construction of power industry facilities. However, in the upcoming winter the shortage of thermal energy in the oblast center will reach 17 percent of the required capacity. There are also problems in national cultural development. The main one is the decline in the level of knowledge and spheres of use of the Jewish language, like, incidentally, the languages of other peoples of our country. We advocate the comprehensive development of all national cultures. We fully support the thesis on recognizing the Russian language as a statewide language. We are creating the conditions for other languages also to be studied on the basis of free choice.

For over a year the Jewish language has been taught in a number of kindergartens and schools in the oblast. Textbooks and methodological aids are now being elaborated. The training of local cadres has begun in the teacher training institute opened this year. Radio broadcasting in the Jewish language has expanded. Local television broadcasting will begin as of next year. A Jewish-folk theater and chamber music theater and an international club for friends of Jewish culture uniting people of all sorts of nationalities operate in the oblast. A NOVOSTI press agency bureau and an "Intourist" department have been opened.

At the same time the population's national cultural demands are hampered by the weakness of the printing and publishing base. Despite repeated appeals, the USSR State Committee for the Press and the RSFSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade are not adopting specific decisions to expedite the planning of a printing combine, open a book publishing house, and equip existing printing plants with the necessary hardware and fonts. The Ministry of Public Education and the RSFSR State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants, and the Book Trade are failing to show proper concern for satisfying the oblast's needs for literature on teaching methods and artistic literature in the Jewish, Ukrainian, and Moldavian languages. We deem it necessary to examine the question of opening a branch of the USSR State Committee for Public Education National Schools

Research Institute on the Orient. The Academy of Sciences is being slow to open research institutes, although a decision has also been adopted on these questions. I also submit a proposal to create on the [Orient] center a statewide research center for interethnic relations.

Basically, the speaker went on, we are materialists. Therefore we know that the level of economic development influences superstructural phenomena, which, among others, include interethnic relations. The deepening of the economic crisis has exacerbated to breaking point the problem of the supply of goods to the population. Against this backdrop the stratification of society, instability, and lack of confidence in the future have been thrown into sharp relief. In this situation forces which speculate on these difficulties and call for civil disobedience toward the authorities and demonstrations and strikes are stepping up their activities. They think least of all about the interests of our people; they seek power and cheap political capital, and they act against the party and its leading role in the perestroyka. We also easily fall prey to the attacks of the anti-Soviet elements and to the free-loading attitudes which have swamped literally whole regions. We do not regard as correct either the decisions of the government aimed at satisfying strikers' demands with consumer goods. People are asking: Why them and not us? In actual fact is it really possible to switch resources from one pocket to another?

I believe that the government must thoroughly size everything up and tell the people the truth as to whether we are in a position on present-day conditions to manage without rationing the consumption of specific goods. And if we are not, it means that it is necessary to give thought to adopting, for a specific period of time, a resolution which would apply throughout the country's territory and would be based on principles of justice rather than the level of stocks in various territories.

The speaker then advocated that greater independence in the solution of economic questions be granted to local soviets. He noted in particular that the amendments to the Law on the State Enterprise which have been adopted at the USSR Supreme Soviet session are not conducive to the enhancement of their role. Basically, they are correct. But should they have been adopted in isolation from other draft laws on the forms of ownership, local economy, local self-management, land leasing, taxation, and so forth? I am convinced that they should not. The upshot is that the rights of enterprises have been further increased, while the soviets' lack of rights has been further compounded.

In this connection with this the speaker stressed that the work of the Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet should be marked by greater farsightedness.

Damage has also been inflicted on perestroyka, he went on, by the delay in holding this Central Committee plenum. The Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet, and the government of the country must admit, and this was noted by the working people, that the responsibility for the situation which has taken shape in the nationalities sphere, including the dramatic events, is partly theirs. A timely and principled assessment was not made of the gradual transformation of national self-admiration into national egoism. Narrow departmentalism, furtherance of local interests, trends toward national exclusivity were not rebutted, and chauvinist and extremist actions were not thwarted at the outset.

The positive role of the mass media in perestroyka has been praised more than once from this rostrum. However, certain of these media are abusing our patience. In my opinion, the journals MOLODAYA GVARDIYA and NASH SOVREMENNIK stand out for their particularly close attention to the so-called "Jewish" question. Frequently, in their articles they openly advocate anti-Semitism. The question arises: Why, in such complex, fateful times are certain people interested in kindling hostility and hatred? In the current, truly explosive situation in interethnic relations we cannot but be alarmed by the process of the rising emigration of the population from the USSR. I believe that this cannot be explained solely by a desire for an easier life or the effects of Western propaganda. It is evident from letters received at the CPSU Center from various parts of the country that people's desire to emigrate is connected to a considerable extent with the rise of chauvinist moods among a certain section of people and the impunity of nationalist groups of the "Pamyat" or "Union of Zionists" type. I must also say that the debate between OGONEK and MOLODAYA GVARDIYA, including the article published in PRAVDA 3 September under the heading "In Line with the Truth" [Sledovat pravde] has long exceeded the framework of literary polemics and is not an expression of a socialist pluralism of opinions. Unfortunately, neither in the foreword, nor in the commentary on the interview is the position of the organ of the Central Committee, the newspaper PRAVDA, on these questions made clear.

The time has come for all of us to grasp that we are children of one and the same great country, making whatever contribution we are capable of to its development and its prosperity. There can be no stepchildren and no outcasts since this would run counter the principles of a humane and civilized society, not to mention the principles of the party of Communists. I believe that in the conditions of the very wide-ranging approach of the mass media to the assessment of events and phenomena and frequently contradictory opinions which are voiced, it is very important to have an authoritative and principled opinion on acute, topical questions of our life from the leadership of our party and members of the Politburo, the government, and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

It would be advisable, the speaker continued, to examine—taking account of people's opinion—the question of placing all the republic's autonomous oblasts under the immediate jurisdiction of organs of state power and

administration of the Russian Federation. The question of the representation of autonomous oblasts in the supreme organs of RSFSR state power and administration also calls for a more thorough examination. In the draft RSFSR law on elections of people's deputies, Article 16, the representation quota per autonomous oblast for the national-territorial okrugs is set at two deputies. Meanwhile, during the recent elections of USSR people's deputies we elected a quota of five 5 deputies. A contradictory situation is taking shape. In the all-union legislative organs there will be more deputies from autonomous formations than in the republic organ which is closer to and has direct links with these formations.

Recalling the history of our federation, it is impossible to overlook the fact that in the twenties there existed the institution of autonomous oblast representatives in executive organs. I consider it possible to revive this representation in the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

All these questions demand immediate examination in the legislative bodies of state power and the introduction of amendments in the USSR and RSFSR Constitutions in connection with the holding of elections to local soviets.

In conclusion the speaker emphasized attention on the following point. The draft platform proposes creating a CPSU Central Committee Bureau for the RSFSR, which was eliminated way back as a superfluous duplicate level of the party leadership. I believe that it is not fully warranted in this case to proceed along a path we have already traveled. If we are to resolve the question of autonomizing Russia's Communists, we must not confine ourselves to half-measures. Clearly we must categorically determine where we stand on the creation of a Russian Communist Party and its Central Committee.

Esteemed Comrades. V.V. Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs, addressed the gathering. The plenum presidium has acquainted me with a memorandum proposing that we hear a report by the minister of internal affairs regarding the measures being taken to combat crime and guarantee citizens' rights and freedoms. At present, the memorandum says, the press blinds people with statistics. The statistics are indeed unfavorable. In the first 8 months of this year crime rose by 13.2 percent and 1,518,000 crimes were committed, including 233,000 serious crimes. This is an unprecedented increase.

If we aim to ensure that statistics reassure people, I can say that crime in Moscow is lower by a factor of 28 than in West Berlin. But that is probably West Berlin's problem rather than Moscow's. The party line has been of late, and still is, opposed to the manipulation of statistics. The Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] strictly adheres to this line.

Crime is on the increase in our country. It is a very alarming situation. The USSR Supreme Soviet has demanded that law-enforcement organs take the requisite steps. If someone expects immediate results and victories, I must disappoint them—that is impossible. However, steps are being taken.

Interim committees led by the local soviets have begun vigorous work in the republics and oblasts. The government has allocated the MVD additional resources to increase the militia's pay and technical backup.

The number of operational-internal troops and investigative organ officials will rise by 26,700 and 5,000 respectively. However, the most important point is that we are now conscious that MVD personnel are beginning to rid themselves of the "playing-safe" complex, passivity, and fear which they had acquired in recent years—and acquired moreover not without the efforts of malevolent anti-perestroyka forces.

Some 26,200 more crimes than last year have been detected and investigated in the last 8 months by inquiry and investigation organs, effectively without an increase in personnel, the speaker pointed out. In order to characterize the situation I want to cite more of these possibly harsh but also indicative figures. Whereas in the first 7 months of this year the militia employed weapons against bandits and criminals 80 times a month on average, in August and the first 15 days in September this figure rose to 90 and 72 respectively. This is not, of course—I would say once again—a figure to take delight in, but it does illustrate all the same that the militia have begun to act more boldly and resolutely.

These are in the most general terms the steps taken in respect of ordinary criminal offenses. As for crime based on interethnic conflicts, mass disturbances, lawlessness, and violence, the situation is far less defined and, let us be blunt, harder to predict. During interethnic disturbances within the country this year and last 292 people have been killed, 5,250 people have sustained bodily injuries, and thousands of apartment blocks have been burned down and looted. Some 160,000 Armenians, Azerbaijanis, Meskhetian Turks, and people of other nationalities have been forced to abandon their homes. Every one of these conflicts has its own causes, its own complexion, and its own protagonists, including, undoubtedly, criminal offenders. And its own instigators: the shadowy leaders of the "shadow economy," mercenary criminal clans, and so on. It must be said that 872 internal affairs organ staffers and servicemen—12 of whom have died—have suffered injury while honestly fulfilling their duty, the speaker continued.

A total of 1,138 cases have been instituted by the USSR Prosecutor's Office and the USSR MVD in respect of all the mass disturbances and interethnic conflicts that have taken place over the last 2 years, while 344 people have hitherto been put on trial and convicted. The actions of our law-enforcement organs here have been extremely retarded. We are primarily punishing outright killers and the perpetrators of violence, but the organizers and instigators—those who directly organize, incite, and lead

by kindling nationalism—regrettable, as has already been said, remain virtually unpunished.

The relevant articles of the Criminal Code operate [illegible] here. In the speaker's opinion, the local authorities are in many respects to blame for this. In a number of regions the instigators of mass disturbances have been released without any justification. How can we speak of inevitable punishment here? We are in effect making criminal heroes of criminals. We lack proper ideological backup for the actions of law-enforcement organs. The effectiveness of law-enforcement measures is also poor because the method being used to settle interethnic conflicts also arouses doubts. A conflict flares up at local level. That is obvious. Why is another question. But the center has to settle it. That is the principle. The leaders of certain republics often display inconsistency and lack of logic here.

[illegible] questions linked with the problems of Nagorno-Karabakh. In his opinion, a way out must be sought by means of compromise, without redrawing borders but by reciprocal steps from each side. If the Azerbaijan Communist Party and the Armenian Communist Party and their Central Committees do indeed exercise a leading role and enjoy prestige among their people, they must be given an opportunity to demonstrate internationalism in action. If the members of a party whose ideology and watchword is internationalism cannot agree among themselves, that means something is not quite right. And I am profoundly convinced that external troops, any troops at all, will not help. We can only offer assistance and assist the authorities in combating any extremist forces.

Before speaking, I had another talk with the people directly involved in our work there, this difficult work in Karabakh. In fact, in clearing away the obstructions in Lachin, Yevlakh, and Agdam, we do not feel that we are in this way helping the worst leaders in these areas combat extremism. Neither feeling is that we are doing this for ourselves alone as it were, without any support and we often sense opposition. The measure of responsibility of the two republics' leaders should be greater. And not only that of the leaders—there there would be less reciprocal incitement.

Talking about mass media coverage of the complex issues of interethnic relations, the speaker said that recently, as some organs of the press have tried to get to the truth, people have often become offended and indignant—even at the level of people seated in this very auditorium. But, after all, political analysis is impossible if you do not call a spade a spade. That is perfectly obvious. A policy of equal glasnost, a policy of wise glasnost—is doing a balancing act—this does nothing but harm, in the opinion of the speaker. It simply clouds the situation, contributes to the proliferation of negative processes and plays into the hands of those who are playing for time and thereby winning those positions which they probably should not be allowed to win.

The key to resolving interethnic problems, the speaker stressed in conclusion, lies in the economy, the social sphere, and the search for common spiritual and moral aims and ideals. But the strengthening of the party must take first place. Everyone has said that from this tribune and said it with great pain. The party must be strengthened. But how?

It is a commonly known fact that a political party can only be strengthened by political struggle and practice. But it must be made clear what we are struggling for. Today nationalists, separatists, radicals, and so forth often call themselves Communists. There are colossal contrasts. It goes without saying that this kind of pluralism can probably be tolerated within the party, but within certain limits. We can agree and disagree about the ways, forms, and methods of building socialism. There really is a wealth of creativity and a wealth of work in this respect. We can argue over the forms of people's power. But there are some questions for Communists which can have only one answer—I am talking about the unity of our union. We are either in favor or not in favor of the union—that is the criterion by which the party must now check its members to see whether they are Communists or not. The party must speak out firmly in favor of the union and against separatism of any kind.

The report and the draft platform [illegible] Shevardnadze, secretary of Tbilisi party obkom, said comprehensively substantiate the current tasks of the party's Leninist nationalities policy. They provide an in-depth analysis vitally linked to the present-day realities of our society. It is perfectly clear that the serious problems which arise in interethnic relations must be resolved in the interests of further strengthening the USSR and harmonizing relations between the nations and ethnic groups. After all, the national issue is not something independent and self-contained in social development but is totally subordinate to its fundamental aims and tasks.

The CPSU platform correctly points out that contradictions between the development of nations and their drawing together and between the desire for independence and the need to deepen international ties have made themselves felt in our multiethnic country.

Recently, the speaker continued, for some reason the mass media, sociopolitical institutes and scientific and creative circles have been giving exclusive one-sided attention to the questions of sovereignty, autonomy, and independence for nations and ethnic groups and the growth of their national self-consciousness. Moreover, these subjects are often treated in isolation from political and socioeconomic factors. The development of nations is sometimes simply reduced to their ethnic development.

However, really tangible processes are taking place in life that are leading to the mutual cognition and drawing together of the Soviet peoples on the basis of economic and sociopolitical commonality. It is wrong to belittle their mobilizing, rallying significance because they also

contain a healthy principle that needs our support. After all, these processes which draw people together have a great impact on the development of every people as [illegible] one of the main conditions of this development.

This particularly applies to smaller peoples. Historical practice has shown that they have reached their present level of development only thanks to unity within the fraternal family of Soviet peoples and the fact that they have drawn closer to them in various spheres of life. In proof of this the speaker cited facts attesting that radical transformations have been made in all spheres of life in Tuva in a historically short space of time thanks to great material assistance from the Soviet state and support from the Russians and other Soviet peoples.

Today the republic has a considerable economic, sociocultural, and cadre potential.

Of course, we do have our problems and shortcomings. By virtue of historical circumstances there is still a substantial difference in our levels of economic and social development and those found in other regions of the country.

We well understand that it is only possible to overcome these difficulties and resolve serious problems—social problems particularly—by deepening restructuring, creating an efficient economy, and making better use of the republic's potential. The speaker went on to note the important significance of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions currently being implemented "On Measures to Accelerate the Economic and Social Development of the Tuva ASSR." He also underlined the importance of proposals to substantially broaden the rights of autonomous republics in all areas of state, economic, and cultural building.

We play a part and must play a part in the all-union division of labor. What is more, the republic's life is sustained by the country's unified national economic complex. In order to ensure that this participation is more effective in conditions of the general orientation toward self-sufficiency, and in order to expand our economic potential, it is essential to organize production for the comprehensive processing of some raw materials in the republic itself. We do not have the possibilities for this at present. I support the proposal that autonomous republics be given more rights to determine for themselves the structure of their national economic development, set up the production sectors they want, develop trade links, and move into the external market.

The speaker proposed that the specific conditions of every territory, particularly autonomous formations, be better taken into account when drafting laws on local self-management and the local economy.

Our republic, [illegible] Shoydak said, cannot manage without state assistance in the immediate future. We talk about this openly and honestly and support the provisions in the party platform for setting up an all-union fund for [illegible] lagging behind in their economic development.

The platform rightly states that great damage has been caused to national living by the predominance of the sectoral principle of management and the departmental ideas connected with this as a result of which national conditions and traditions and ecological requirements have not always been considered. We have also experienced this ourselves. In connection with the construction of the Sayano-Shushenskaya hydroelectric power station and the formation of its reservoir on the republic's territory, over 23,000 hectares of agricultural lands are being inundated. This will put the agriculture of one of the republic's largest regions in an exceptionally difficult position. To defuse the situation to at least some extent we are raising the question of reducing the level of construction of the zone on the republic's territory, at least by 5 meters, that is, stopping at the 551-meter mark and not 560 meters as planned. We ask the USSR Council of Ministers to support us in this.

The party is setting the task of raising cultural policy to a qualitatively new level. Here, as before, a recognition of the uniqueness of national cultures, the denunciation of any forms of encroachment on them, and at the same time the creation of conditions for the development of internationalist processes and the interaction of cultures are important.

Our experience shows that national culture should not be contained within itself. Moreover, it can develop successfully only on the basis of a general national Soviet culture in close interaction with the cultures of other peoples. In conditions of national autonomy the development of national-Russian and Russian-national bilingualism is most vital. That accords with one of Lenin's most important provisions on equal rights for and the free development of languages. It is very important to draw attention to the content and function of the state language. If it is a national emblem, a means of cultural and spiritual growth, then that is one thing. But if the state language, by becoming legally binding for all citizens of the republics, restricts their right to use other languages and violates their equal rights, that is another.

For the indigenous populations of Tuva, alongside their native language, the mastering of the Russian language is exceptionally topical. That is an objective requirement. The Russian language makes it possible to gain access to the achievements of the spiritual and material culture of the Russian and other Soviet peoples and helps in direct communication, in labor and public life, in daily life, in study, and in military service. In this connection the speaker touched on cadres and other problems connected with teaching the Russian language.

In conditions where ethnic and interethnic problems are closely linked with people's mentality and social awareness and the determination of their attitude toward the representatives of other nations, the role of all the party's ideological work based on a firm ideological and theoretical foundation is increasing more than ever. Here emphasis should be placed on shaping people's internationalist awareness.

Life shows that the growth of people's national self-awareness is not automatically accompanied by the growth of their internationalist awareness. And that often leads some people to incline toward nationalism, toward a position of national narrow-mindedness. The report spoke clearly of Communists' responsibility for strengthening the friendship of our peoples and asserting mutual trust and respect among them. That applies particularly to leadership officials in the national republics.

The speaker then described how some citizens of capitalist countries who come to Tiraspol undertake acts of provocation and try to destabilize interethnic relations in the republic and to sow antisocialist, anti-Russian sentiments. Various circles from the Baltic republics and some other places are making similar appeals. All this must be considered in our practical work.

In conclusion the speaker associated himself with the proposals not to hold obkom, kraykom, and union republic communist party central committee bureau reports this year but to do it in the summer, when the schedule of the precongress measures has been set. He also expressed himself in favor of restoring the autonomous republic ministries under the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

V.M. Mishin, secretary of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions [AUCCTU], was given the floor.

Each one of us obviously also feels the acuteness of interethnic problems through our own political practice. I too had occasion to feel this in full measure during my work on the Special Administration Committee in Nagorno-Karabakh. While sharing and supporting the assessments and conclusions of the report as a Communist and trade union official I would like to impart some ideas on ways of overcoming interethnic contradictions.

Interethnic conflicts have also been manifested acutely in the trade union movement. In the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast the trade unions have been virtually bankrupt in Armenia and Azerbaijan they have been unable to oppose the discrimination and the expulsion of people from work and from their homes, while in Moldavia and Estonia they have failed to become a real force for the consolidation of working people of different nationalities. These questions, together with acute socio-economic problems, were the focus of attention of the recent South AUCCTU Plenum.

In supporting the CPSU platform the plenum has expressed itself unambiguously in favor of really ensuring equal labor, civil, and political rights and social protection for all Soviet people in all our union and autonomous formations, irrespective of nationality, place of residence, and religion. The concept of "priority for the indigenous nation," which proposes ways toward the prosperity of one people via discrimination against particular groups of the population, has thereby been categorically rejected.

The CPSU platform proclaims the policy of supporting diversity as the fund of socialist civilization's values. It is necessary to give back to peoples, be they large or small, their land and their right to independent [samobytnyy] development which was trampled in the past. But there is no magic wand which can be waved to accomplish this overnight. Therefore, the speaker believes, the platform must form the foundation of the ramified party and state action program on the nationalities question. Today we need complex theoretical clarity on questions concerning the dialectics of the national and the interethnic, questions concerning the correlation of natural and social factors in an ethnic group's development and many other questions concerning the very subtle and delicate sphere of interethnic relations. We also need an institute of interethnic relations as a major scientific research center to study ways and means of implementing the state's nationalities policy.

In my view one of the fundamental causes of the exacerbation of interethnic relations is the fact that during the last few decades the party as a whole and the union republic party organizations have lost sight of the most important political questions of shaping national detachments of the working class. A completely wrong deployment of productive forces resulted from what were essentially technocratic trends in the economy, which totally ignored social, demographic, national and ethnic factors. Today we are coming up against the sociopolitical consequences of these decisions which were not always thought through, of the importation of a work force into densely populated areas, and of the absence of systematic work to involve the local able-bodied population in social production.

Spellbound by the false thesis about society's growing homogeneity, we actually contributed to the creation of many of today's spots of interethnic tension. Major imbalances developed in the structure of the population's employment. It remains a fact that a racial division of labor among representatives of different nationalities exists in many territorial units.

Last week the AUCCTU decided to act as cofounder of an international center for small enterprises. Its action program includes the siting of small, flexible production capacities in those areas of the country with surplus manpower. This will help reduce the acuteness of unemployment, which has today become a reality in a number of regions. This provides an opportunity to actively consolidate the worker stratum among the population of

union and autonomous formations, and to introduce national cadres as soon as possible to the high technology of modern production.

Recently, the speaker went on, there has been a noticeable galvanization of attempts to set socialism in opposition to democracy and to use democracy against socialism. Voices can be heard saying that the very nature of our society supposedly hinders the democratic solution of pressing problems, including ethnic problems.

This also provokes attacks on our working class, which is international by its very nature, claiming that it has supposedly ceased being the subject of social progress. The administrative-edict system really did push the country's working class to the periphery of social processes. For many years on end it resembled Ilya Muromets of epic fame, who just sat at home "for the time being." But the mass strikes and conflicts in many of the country's regions have shown that the working class is autonomously entering the arena of struggle for its socioeconomic and political rights.

The trade unions have been and still are being rightly criticized for this. Now they are working out their policy, tactics, and line of behavior, seeking forms of collaboration with strike and work-stoppage committees and the various newly emerged organs of workers self-management. But in this situation we cannot allow party organizations to remain on the sidelines or behind the trade unions. During its discussion of the strike question the ALUCTU plenum took a considered approach and displayed its awareness that this is a double-edged, exceptional, and extreme measure and that, in order to have less frequent resort to it, we need a reliable and effective mechanism for the prompt solution of emerging conflicts.

This is why, for about a year now, we have been striving for the adoption of a law on the resolution of collective labor disputes. I think that the perception of strikes as a foreign body of decaying capitalism is, to say the least, short-sighted.

At the present stage the party's paramount duty would appear to be to help our working class flex its muscles and overcome its political alienation, which, I think, no matter how paradoxical this might appear, has in many places continued to grow also as the conditions of perestroyka.

The ALUCTU plenum, the speaker went on, backed the idea of holding elections to republic and local soviets of people's deputies not only in territorial and national-territorial okrugs but also in production okrugs (specially, in major industrial centers). This approach will really enable labor collectives to represent and uphold their interests in the organs of power. On the ALUCTU's behalf the speaker asked the CPSU Central Committee and the union republic communist party central committees to carefully examine these proposals by working people and to make the appropriate submissions to the republic Supreme Soviets.

The local soviet elections will be a serious political test for our party, he said. The reality is that we already have various social structures capable of intervening in the resolution of political situations. According to the latest public opinion polls held by the Sociology Institute three-fourths of voters have yet to decide their preferences. These stances can be confused by populist phraseology.

In these conditions it is exceptionally important to clearly define the party's social base in the election campaign and to unambiguously identify it in the CPSU's election campaign platform. This must be done immediately, without any procrastination. It is necessary to elaborate specific action programs with which local party organizations will join the election campaign on their territory. It is necessary to rally around these programs society's healthy perestroyka forces and to finally create a proper bloc of Communists and nonparty people.

The expansion of union republics' rights, the introduction of regional economic accountability, and other processes aimed at improving Soviet statehood demand an enhancement of the role and status of the CPSU's national detachments. While fully supporting the idea of the inadmissibility of federalism within the party, the speaker backed the suggestion to study in depth the question of the possibility of organizationally forming a Russian Communist Party within the CPSU's framework. Such a formation, he said, would consolidate the ranks of our ranks.

Concern has recently been expressed about the processes of withdrawal from the party's ranks. In connection with the preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress it is necessary to analyze who is proclaiming his disappointment with the Communist Party and why. I believe, the speaker said, that it is necessary to resolutely distance ourselves—and the sooner the better—from those who, while formally being party members and even members of its elected organs, promote ideas which are alien to our party's essence and spirit and act against its line. It is equally important to examine the nature of the replenishment which has joined the party during the 4 years of perestroyka and the place it has adopted in the party's life. There can be no true renewal of the party without influence on the party youth and its active involvement in the real practice of political struggle at the key sectors of party, state, and economic building.

This concluded the debate at the CPSU Central Committee plenum.

Further on CPSU Plenum Speeches 28 Sep

[illegible] Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0630 GMT 29 Sep 89

[This account of the speeches made at the CPSU Central Committee plenum on the nationalities issue on 28

September does not contain the remarks made by Y. Ligachev, which appeared separately on the 22 September issue of the Soviet DAILY REPORT, p 59, column 2 under the rubric 'More 20 Sep Party Plenum Speeches Reported']

[Excerpts] Moscow, 21 Sep (TASS)—We are transmitting an account of the speeches of participants in the CPSU Central Committee plenum at the morning session on 20 September where discussion of Mikhail Gorbachev's report continued.

In his speech Islam Karimov, first secretary of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan CC, noted that the in-depth and all-round discussion of the party's draft platform on the nationality question testifies to the people's support for the course chosen by the CPSU Central Committee regarding the improvement of interethnic relations and the building of a Soviet Federation in the new conditions.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report at the plenum emphasizes yet again the urgent need for a critical analysis of the path traversed during the formation of interethnic relations in our country, the assertion of the creative development of Leninist norms and principles in nationality policy and purifying them of artificial later developments and deformations.

The speaker critically assessed some mass media reports on the latest events in Uzbekistan, in particular in Fergana Oblast. We are far from the idea of simplifying the causes of the tragic events in Fergana, Islam Karimov stressed. What is more, we condemn such attempts and believe them to be politically detrimental. The speaker went on to talk about the lessons learned in the republic from the events in Fergana. The Communist Party of Uzbekistan Central Committee, he said, had harshly appraised the tragic events in Fergana Oblast. Party and criminal proceedings have been and are being instigated against those to blame. The Uzbek people have always been, are, and will be true friends and brothers of all the Soviet peoples.

Then the speaker touched upon problems which are complicating the socio-political situation in the region. This is, above all, the question of employment. In the republic there are about a million mobile labor resources not employed in the public production sphere.

Not providing work for people in rural areas in particular leads to low social labor productivity.

Today in Uzbekistan more than 43 percent of the population have incomes less than R75 per capita, or lower than subsistence wage.

The situation is complicated, the speaker continued, by the one-sided and hypertrophied development of the national economy, where production requiring unskilled labor and branches of primary processing of raw material prevail.

If we add to this list of problems the serious mistakes and exaggerations, the command-administrative, strong-willed and vulgar approach which has been allowed in the so-called cotton matters and also in the evaluation of historic and cultural values, customs and traditions of the people, then one will understand also the soil on which today's social and inter-nationalities tensions is growing in the republic.

We understand and reckon that solutions of all these complex problems depends first of all on ourselves alone. However, in our opinion, without drawing up a comprehensive program developing our entire central Asian region, we cannot manage. Union organs must lead the drafting of this program.

The republic, Islam Karimov said, with the help of the CPSU Central Committee and the country's government, is carrying out a real search for ways to reduce economic and social tension, above all by a fuller use of existing potential.

Directly linked with an improvement in the socio-political situation is an urgent and just solution to the demands of the Crimean Tatars, Meskhetian Turks and Kurds who were deported to Uzbekistan, the speaker said. We fully support the idea in the report about the need for the speediest possible solution to this historic injustice.

We see no sense in seeking alternatives to the federal structure of our state. Yes, we favor the precise demarcation of the functions, competence and mutual obligations of the union and the republics, and, as stated in the draft platform, of all-round strengthening of the republics sovereignty and the bonding of our mutual relations on full financial autonomy. We are in favor of filling the concept of the "Soviet federation" with new content, and of a return of the truly Leninist concept of federation which permits neither unitariness [unitarnost] nor the turning of democratic centralism into the absolute dictatorship of the bureaucratic system.

At the same time, the speaker emphasized, we consider unacceptable the proposal by certain republics to shape our mutual relations on the principles of confederation.

The catalog in the draft platform of the questions of strengthening the independence of republican Communist parties within the framework of the existing structure, granting them the right to decide organizational-structural, personnel and financial issues and to adopt their own political documents within the confines of the CPSU Program is both timely and very topical.

The processes which we have come to call a growth of national self-awareness, and which in Soviet Latvia have received the definition "national awakening," are in my view not a by-product but an integral part of perestroyka, Jan Vagris, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, said in his speech. It is perfectly natural that today we are discussing not only the

further improvement of inter-ethnic relations but a new model for them, and a new concept of the party's nationalities policy.

In the CPSU draft platform we saw with satisfaction many of those points which were voiced in the republic during the preparations for this plenum.

I will permit myself to draw your attention to just four problems which directly concern the party's nationalities policy.

First, the Latvian Communist Party fully supports the conclusion in the CPSU platform on the need for radical changes in the Soviet federation, and for its qualitative renewal, and comes out in favor of Latvia's sovereignty within the federation of Soviet republics, based on treaty relations which fully and specifically reflect the special characteristics of each republic or region's development.

It is justifiably emphasized in the CPSU platform that the development of our federation will be stable and successful given an optimum correlation between the rights of the union republics and the USSR as a whole. To achieve this it is necessary to precisely define the competence and mutual obligations of the Union and the republics. The party's political attitudes to this way of posing the question are set out in the section "How to restructure the Soviet federation and make it full-blooded."

But, the speaker considers, one cannot help but observe its internal contradictoriness. He dwelt on certain formulations which, in his opinion, required further editing.

The very logic of things says that one should start by determining the fullness of the rights and competence of the republic and further determine the extent of the limitation on its sovereignty, to which the union republics should agree consciously and voluntarily for the sake of the existence and successful development of the union state. We are in favor of real but not formal sovereignty of the union republics, of a new status of filling our federation with modern content, but by no means of destroying it.

The second thing is that we consider the conclusion of the CPSU platform to be especially important with regard to the economic content, self-determination, and sovereignty in present-day conditions being expressed in the transition of the republics to financial autonomy and self-financing. From 1 January of next year, Latvia will already be going over to the new conditions.

People are waiting for us to show in actual fact our ability to fully obtain that huge, hitherto untapped, operating potential which is stored up in the Soviet federation. At the level of the country's highest party and state leadership our actions regarding the transition of the republic to financial autonomy and self-financing are meeting with understanding. At the lower stages, however, one comes up against departmental egoism and, at times, even a reluctance to look carefully into this problem.

We have attentively listened to Yu. D. Maslyukov's speech. We know of and think highly of his energy and efforts in resolving the problems of financial autonomy, but the fears expressed yesterday of taking the radical steps that the Baltic republics are fighting for have put us on our guard.

The third thing is that the problem of restructuring the party itself is being actively and pointedly discussed in the republic. The conclusions of the 18 June CPSU Central Committee Conference have served as a considerable stimulus to the discussion, as well as the approaches outlined in the CPSU draft platform. Objectively, in the very logic of perestroyka, we are faced with the problem of the new status of the Communist Party of a union republic. The dialectics here are, moreover, simple. The status of a communist party, let's say the Communist Party of Latvia, in the composition of the USSR.

The fourth thing is that in many regions of our country, including the Baltic republics, it is the problems that have accumulated over the past decades precisely in the sphere of national relations that have become a kind of catalyst for social problems.

The renewal of the nationality policy, the elimination of the distortions of past years are not possible without overcoming the dogmatism in the understanding of the dialectics of national and interethnic values and interests.

In a short time, as Latvia, he said, serious sociopolitical changes have occurred and they are taking place in a contradictory fashion, and political radicalism is making itself felt, especially of late. But the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee is convinced and has said so in its address to Communists, to all the working people in the republic, that the activity of extremist groups trying to bar the path of perestroyka from various sides, is not having and cannot have a decisive effect on the processes of renewal in the republic.

The floor is given to Arkadiy Volskiy, chairman of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] special administration committee. Today many people do not feel completely satisfied. This discontent is increasingly acquiring the form of diametrically opposed points of view and even of undisguised clashes. Aggressiveness and the irreconcilable nature of each conflict are markedly increasing. In the speaker's view, in a number of regions the situation has simply gotten out of control and has led to local bodies making concessions bordering on capitulation.

Nationalism is always a provocation. And it is the young who are its first victims. In the speaker's opinion, the

national patriots' aims are unambiguous: to fight for power and to hunt on unlimited regionalism [mestnichestvo].

In many cases our state appears to be simply unprotected. Having supported this thought with a number of arguments, the speaker emphasized that for ensuring healthy democratic experience a definite historical stage must be reached.

Highly topical is the need to give the internal troops wider powers and rights in cases of mass unrest and of threat to the security of citizens.

Moving on to the situation in Nagorno-Karabakh, the chairman of the committee of special administration said that we are still shrinking from calling a spade a spade and exposing the full depth of the conflict taking place here. M.S. Gorbachev's speech gave possible for the first time a tough and fair assessment of the events taking place here. Having worked in that region for a year and 2 months, I cannot predict that lasting peace will be restored in the near future unless necessary and adequate measures are taken.

The reality is that the formal and informal leaders of Azerbaijan and Armenia are constantly adding fuel to the fire because of Nagorno-Karabakh, and are not striving for good relations. No steps are being taken towards friendship or even towards acceptable mutual relations. No one wants to make even minor concessions. If we face the truth, the republics are today on the brink of inter-ethnic war, and are often overstepping that brink. At times the Karabakh question is being associated with perestroika; the Western media are especially zealous in this, and so are some of our own. Believe me, said the speaker, there are no grounds for this—perestroika has not even reached our part of the country yet.

The cause lies elsewhere: in the crass mistakes of the leading organs of both republics. Even in the tragic events of November and December of last year, when hundreds of thousands of people were driven out of both republics, even then, the leaders of the republican organizations did not come to their senses, did not wake up, did not reach out to each other. This mutual alienation, endless accusations of the other side, unwillingness to inquire into its interests, has been the main reason for persisting tension in the region.

The country's leadership has continuously sought a way out of the situation which has arisen. Undoubtedly, the introduction of the special form of administration has created an atmosphere. Arkadiy Volskiy continued, which could have defused the situation. But in practice it failed in many respects. The status of the committee has still not been defined and there is no statute dealing with it. This has given the extremists a pretext for calling it unconstitutional.

Today the situation in the region has deteriorated sharply. As yet, there is no question of compromise. The NKAO is virtually under a blockade, from which both the Armenian and the Azerbaijani population are suffering. Matters have gone so far that a disastrous situation has developed regarding food, fuel, and medical supplies.

When in power, the commission of people's deputies set up by the USSR Supreme Soviet looked deeply into the problems of the NKAO, elucidated and took into consideration the interests of both sides. But one thing rings alarm bells, the speaker noted. Without waiting for the conclusions and proposals of the esteemed people's deputies, the atmosphere is being whipped up both in Azerbaijan and in Armenia. And the revealing thing is that, for all the confrontation of the warring sides, their slogans and appeals are practically the same.

The main thing now is not to teach and lecture one another, but to learn together. To sit down at one table: the leaders, the representatives of the intelligentsia, the deputies, and perhaps the informals. You simply have to be with the people. If you want to lead the people to a state of tranquility.

Concluding his address, the chairman of the committee of special administration underlined the need to use the power of party influence and authority in such a way that the extremists will lose their influence over the people.

On the platform is Natalya Gellert, a machine operator at the Amangeldy state farm in Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. We have many problems, and they must all be taken into account. One of the most urgent of these is the problem of the deportation of peoples, who for already about half a century have been deprived of their statehood. I understand and hold dear the pain of all these peoples. But because I am more familiar with the position and the problems of 2 million Soviet Germans, I would like to dwell just upon them. After the liquidation in 1941 of the autonomous republic on the Volga and the evacuation of the Germans to Siberia and Kazakhstan, after the labor and army camps where the whole adult population from the years of 15-16 upwards was thrown behind barbed wire, after the long years of the regime of special deportation—violation of which cost one 25 years of forced labor—and after long years of all kinds of discrimination in the political, public, and cultural life of the country, the Soviet Germans now find themselves in a situation which it would be too mild even to describe as critical. They are scattered across this whole vast country, they do not have a single national school, not a single secondary and higher educational establishment. Masses of them have lost their mother tongue, and their culture has been virtually destroyed. The restoration of statehood for the Soviet Germans, for which they have been striving for many years, is their last chance to preserve themselves as a people. The need to solve this problem in principle was stated in the report. This was spoken about too, as is known, at the congress of USSR People's Deputies and at the USSR Supreme Soviet session. However, Soviet Germans are concerned about the uncertainness over this issue.

N. Gelbert continued: What is it that causes anxiety among the Germans? They are worried that at the present time no one is talking about the restoration of the autonomous republic but about the need for a stage-by-stage solution to this question. As I understand it, this provides, at the outset, say, for the formation of a national region. Then, depending on how it is inhabited and developed, an autonomous oblast. And only after that, an autonomous republic.

Of course, there is a kind of logic about such a draft, and in a normal situation it could be considered a correct one. However, one must take into account the extremely complex position in which the Germans are today. Their demands, aspirations, and hopes have been ignored for so long that many people have finally lost faith in justice toward them ever being restored. The departure of Soviet Germans has already acquired an unprecedented scale. Such a solution will compel hundreds of thousands more working people to take this desperate step. Soviet Germans are putting the question quite simply: a decision must be adopted immediately on the restoration of their autonomous republic, and at the same time a decision must be adopted on the creation or the restoration of national regions and rural soviets in areas where there is a compact German population. I believe that these expectations will be reflected in the decisions of our plenum.

The second thing which worries Soviet Germans, and no less than the shaping of their autonomy, is the time scale of the adoption of a decision on its restoration. One may definitely state that this time scale has already long passed.

And the final thing I want to talk about is the fate of those who during the war years were mobilized to the so-called labor army. At best only half of them were still alive by the time the war ended. Up to now they have not been placed on an equal footing with participants in the great patriotic war. It is high time this injustice with regard to the Soviet Germans was put right.

Gumer Usmanov, first secretary of the Tatar Oblast party committee who spoke at the plenum, said that the question of bringing forward the next party congress, which is to give answers to questions connected with the party's renewal and with determining its place and role in society's revolutionary transformations, had been raised perfectly correctly and timely.

The CPSU's draft political platform has aroused a lively interest among all the working people of the republic. This document and the tenets of Mikhail Gorbachev's report are a serious step in interpreting the national processes taking place in the country and serve as a good foundation for shaping the party's present-day nationalities policy.

Russians, Chuvash people, Mari people, Mordvins, Udmurt people, and representatives of many other peoples have been living in our multinational republic, together with the Tatars, from the earliest times; the speaker noted. For them Tataria has been their homeland for several generations now. That is why today we are trying to do everything possible so that the age-old traditions of good neighborliness and friendship between them should multiply and so that the warm climate of interethnic relations which has been in existence for a long time should not be darkened by discussions and clashes on an ethnic basis. But I am far from the thought of idealizing the situation. People today are speaking openly about what worries and troubles them and are calling on us for more vigorous actions to resolve the entire complex of questions which have piled up in interethnic relations.

As a result of the deformations of Lenin's nationalities policy, peoples have found themselves in an unequal position. Some acquired the status of union republics, others that of an autonomous republic, while some were deprived of both. Today this circumstance is giving rise to justified criticism and sometimes to a painful reaction from people.

The reality is such that many autonomous republics, which in terms of their economic, scientific, technical, and intellectual potential, their population, and other parameters are not inferior to certain republics, have far fewer possibilities for their development.

The ranking system of republics, which has come about, has consolidated not only the hierarchy in terms of national statehood but also that of national cultures. The rights and possibilities of autonomous republics are of a lower order than those of union republics. Sociological research carried out in the republic has shown that 2/3 percent of those questioned see the way out of the situation which has arisen in raising the status of autonomous republics to the level of union republics, the speaker continued. Or they propose that the division into union and autonomous republics should be abandoned altogether.

The idea concerning the possibility of development of forms of statehood for nationalities and autonomy and the emergence of new nationalities [natsionalnye obrazovaniya] ought to be reflected in the CPSU's platform on the nationalities question.

Today, it is necessary already to begin to work out the foundations of the legislation of the union of the SSR, union and autonomous republics, concerning a federation of relations between nationalities. One would like to support the proposal of the comrades who had spoken to the effect that instead the proposed bureau or secretariat of the CPSU Central Committee in charge of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], a communist party of the Russian federation ought to be organized, along with other structures existing in the union republics being set up.

Speaking of the problem of economic independence, the speaker noted that Tataria is among the most economically developed regions of the RSFSR. At the same time, however, the level of material well-being and social

welfare provisions for its population is, so far as a whole range of the most important indicators is concerned, considerably lower than the RSFSR's average. It has to be said that this situation encroaches upon the rights of not just the indigenous nationality alone.

An analysis of our economic potential shows that Tataria is capable of safeguarding its own development through its own resources, settling payments with the state budgets of the USSR and the RSFSR. According to our calculations, the republic's revenue exceeds expenditure by R2 and 3 billion. At present, the republic is almost ready to go over to regional financial autonomy. Having touched on an acute question—making good the ecological damage done to various regions of the country as a result of their industrial development—the first secretary of the oblast party committee noted that in Tataria, for example, some 2 and 3 billion tonnes of oil have been extracted to date. Even according to today's exceptionally low prices for oil, this amounts to 5,750 billion, while the republic has practically had nothing and continues to have nothing out of it.

The public in our republic has noted with great approval that in the CPSU platform, in essence for the first time, attention has been paid to the problems of people living outside their national-state formations, continued the speaker.

Until recently, people who were torn from their national roots and native land by fate were not spoiled with attention. We actively feel this, receiving a large quantity of letters from Tatars who live in more than 80 regions of the country, many of whom speak of their national-cultural needs not being satisfied.

The floor was given to Anatoliy Vlasenko, first secretary of the Smolensk Oblast party committee. Events of the last months, noted the speaker, have convincingly shown just how topical is the question which is being discussed at the plenum today. Interethnic conflicts in the Transcaucasus, unconcealed separatism in the Baltic republics and Moldavia, and in other regions, have complicated the situation in the country to the limit and have created a threat to the existence of our multinational state. We are talking about whether it will remain a federation of free and equal Soviet Republics, as Lenin had in mind, or will national egoism destroy our union.

Today the party, continued the speaker, is armed with a constructive program of solutions for national problems. And the main thing is that it is now essential to give a decisive rebuff to forces which are whipping up nationalist hysteria and putting forward anti-humanist, blatantly anti-Soviet and anti-socialist slogans. National egoism has already brought our people considerable grief. The wave has even reached central oblasts of Russia. Recently the inhabitants of Smolensk Oblast took in more than 2,000 refugee Turk Meskhetians from Uzbekistan. Our people perceived their despair and grief with understanding and pain, especially the older generation.

The tragedy which took place in Fergana brought about an angry protest from our people against the actions of the nationalists. No kind of mistakes committed in the past give the right to discriminate against either small or large peoples. In the country today tens of millions of people are living on land which is not that of their forefathers. Even in our oblast, Russian since time immemorial, there are 50 nationalities. One can imagine what will happen if all republics apply the methods of Armenian, Azerbaijani, and Uzbek nationalists, or if they go along the road of the Lithuanian and Estonian comrades.

The floor is given to M.I. Nenashev, USSR state committee for television and radio broadcasting chairman. If one were to try to bring together all the worries and concerns of recent times, he said, and single out the most important of them, this would undoubtedly be concern for the party, for its authority, for its fighting ability and for its credibility.

Why was the party unable to withstand the processes of deformation of socialism? While at those critical moments when it found the strength to oppose the adverse processes and defined a positive program, the work to be done—and this occurred more than once—it limited itself merely to changes from above.

I think that we communists must be frank and say that the attitude toward the party today and the fall in its authority are rooted, in many ways, both in its distant and not-so-distant past, but most of all in its present. We are all aware that even to this day there is much in its organizational methods that is founded on command-administrative methods, on senseless obedience, and this does not strengthen our party. Nor is its political authority strengthened by the existing system of political agitation and propaganda. I want to talk about this frankly, for the system of our agitation and propaganda, in many cases based on dogmatism, on brainwashing methods, more often than not does not convince one, does evoke interest, and largely irritates people. It would simply be unjust not to say that.

Individually, I want to talk about the more complex, the ideological situation, which we are obliged to overcome right now.

In actual fact the ideological situation today is an extremely complicated one. Characteristic of the time [illegible] one has to recognize that frankly as well as a certain lowering in the party leadership of the press, radio, and television. There is a great deal of truth in the criticism which comrades have expressed here and formerly at plenums. I think this occurs because commanding in the old fashion, basing work with the party on thoughtless obedience is no longer possible, but we do not know how to manage it in a new way, to be frank about it, we are in an hurry.

The weakening of party influence on the media at the present time, as it seems to me, is evident in the fact that under the conditions of democratization and glasnost a

perhaps, paradoxical situation has come about which has been quite unexpected for all us communists. On the one hand, democratism and glasnost are being demonstrated, and, on the other hand, a certain monopolization of public opinion has formed.

On the platform is M.Yu. Yusupov, first secretary of the CPSU Dagestan oblast committee. While fully supporting the principled idea of the CPSU platform of the presentation of greater independence and freedom to the union republics, he noted that the radical renewal of national policy and interethnic relations it seems is possible only by the granting of the same real rights to all the autonomous republics as well.

In connection with this he proposed that the main principles on the platform which would make it possible to exploit the national potential of the republics and the advantages of the federal union more effectively be clearly highlighted. He devoted attention to overcoming the causes which have given rise to the uneven development of the republics and regions, noting that a mechanism is also needed which will make it possible overcome the lagging of some republics behind others. The absence of such a mechanism leads in particular to the generation of unjustified, expensive migratory currents within the republic and beyond its limits. This in its turn, may become the cause of the formation of new zones of social and ethnic tension.

The speaker said further that the party's draft platform directs us toward preserving the originality of every people as a unique historical creation and toward regulating its potential spiritual and moral possibilities and social experience. This is also where the attractiveness of the concept of nationalities policy under discussion lies.

Speaking of the spiritual development of nations, he underlined the importance of the fact that all the representatives of a given nationality are carriers of its cultural and linguistic traditions, even including those who, by the force of the circumstances of life, have turned out to be settled in various territories together with other peoples. In Dagestan every 10th family is of mixed nationality, and every fourth marriage carried out on the towns is also of mixed nationality. Therefore the idea of the party platform on creating ethnic cultural centers in places of joint residence of members of different nationalities is close to them.

M.Yu. Yusupov said the existence of experience has confirmed the validity of the folk wisdom that friendship is the mainstay of peace. It is especially essential for us to remember about this now, during an important time in the revolutionary renewal of Soviet society.

A.RKO Vezirov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Central Committee believes that the central committee plenum should also come out firmly and clearly against attempts to change the laws to the benefit of narrow nationalistic aspirations to try to achieve advantages for one people at the expense of another, or more than that, at the expense of the whole country. It seems to us that we need to speak clearly also about such a question as the right of nations to self-determination. Everyone knows that it is the nation as a whole and not individual parts of it that has the right to this. The principle of self-determination must not be reduced merely to the right to separate; it also includes the extension of chances for self-management for ensuring all the benefits of federation, and that means also responsibility toward its members.

The speaker noted that the national processes in Azerbaijan are unfolding in a contradictory and complicated way.

On the subject of the events connected with the NKAO, A.RKO Vezirov said that the conflict had become so drawn-out chiefly because the separatist nationalist forces had throughout the whole time been supported actively by some circles in Armenia and the Armenian diaspora, and on the other hand, there is manifest an unjustified unwillingness to compromise by our nationalities forces.

We categorically condemn the blockade of the roads, and what is being done against our neighboring republic. I would not want people to form the impression that this is taking place only through the fault of one side.

We have done and will do everything in our power not to permit an outbreak of passions on an interethnic basis, the speaker said. The persons who perpetrated unlawful actions have been punished. But I want to state also the following: the fact that many are demanding an answer to the question as to why there is interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign republic, is one of the main reasons for the unsanctioned meetings and strikes which took place in November of last year and in the past few days in Baku. We cannot explain to people why the entire Azerbaijan population has been expelled from Armenia, why the conditions are not being created for its return and why for the time being the damage done to it is not being compensated.

We see the solution of the problem of the NKAO only with a constitutional framework, including by means of ensuring the conditions for the organization of elections and the resumption of the activities of party and local soviet bodies. The republic guarantees all obligations, in the oblast security, satisfaction of their needs in the economic, social and intellectual spheres, and, of course, we will see to it that there is never a return of the practices which led to these events.

A. Makhkamov, first secretary of the Turkmen Communist Party Central Committee, is of the opinion that the CPSU draft platform speaks quite rightly of the transformation of unity into a self-governed peoples the speaker continued. However, in our view deformations in resolving the nationalities questions were expressed not only in the deportation of entire peoples, mass repressions, and the disregard of economic interests. Liberalism-unions was allowed to occur and mistakes were also made in determining national-territorial boundaries – both of union and autonomous formations. What has

been said must not, of course, be regarded as a demand for the borders to be revised. But one must not retreat from the questions posed by life itself. What is meant is the solution of questions linked with the fullest satisfaction of the spiritual, linguistic, cultural and other requirements of people living beyond the confines of their national-territorial formations.

It is very important that the questions of the role and place of the CPSU in the conditions of the filling of our federation with real political and economic content have been posed in the draft platform from the standpoint of perestroyka, the speaker noted. We totally support the conclusion that the fragmentation of the CPSU on the basis of nationality is fundamentally unacceptable, the speaker said. The party has been and must remain internationalist in composition, and ideologically and organizationally united, with a common program and set of rules.

Talking about measures to improve relations between nationalities, the speaker called for a fundamental change throughout the work on the international education of the masses, especially of young people. Distortions in national policy have affected this sphere very strongly.

Recently there has been tension on national questions in practically all republics, the speaker said in conclusion. To tackle them better and more effectively, one condition is essential. We should trust each other more.

The floor was then given to D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense. The speaker said that the armed forces support the policy of the party. The communists of the Army and Navy approve of the proposal on the convening of the next 28th CPSU Congress.

Lately, he continued, there have been even more loud calls for our Army, to be dispersed to national quarters and categorical demands for the creation of national troop formations and for military service by people of an indigenous nationality to be exclusively within the territories of their own republics. D.T. Yazov recalled that back at the dawn of Soviet power V.I. Lenin, in substantiating the objective need for the unity of the Soviet republics in the matter of defense, emphasized the vital importance of welding all the military forces together into a powerful internationalist Red Army.

Characterizing in detail NATO's course and the extensive military preparations in the West, the minister said that all this obliges one to have not only sufficient defense but indeed absolutely reliable defense and combat-ready armed forces, both belonging to our country and also to the Warsaw Treaty as a whole.

Undoubtedly, the speaker said, in a law-governed state there should be a law-governed army. In the interests of preserving our Army as an internationalist one, the contribution of each republic to defense construction in accordance with its potential has ought obviously to be defined by legislation. It is essential to display effective concern for the study of Russian in the union republics. It is the language for interethnic communication in our country. In the Army and the Navy all instruction and education is conducted only in this language.

Life requires the precise definition in the law on defense that is being drafted of the special status of our army and the securing of its socially protected character as a union institution at state level. A clear answer should be given to the question of the Army's function and its involvement in resolving internal tasks and problems should be regulated, the minister said.

The floor was given to V.A. Yemelyanov, first secretary of the Kabardin-Balkar CPSU oblast party committee. He said that only on the basis of the realistic establishment of equal opportunities for the development of peoples, especially socioeconomic opportunities, is it possible to remove and avert a large proportion of the differences which are arising at present in the development of nations and in interethnic relations. The tasks of ensuring this provision, he believed, should be more clearly reflected in the CPSU platform. In particular it would be expedient in the new USSR Constitution to enshrine the right of the autonomous republics to adopt the final decision on a whole number of economic, social, political, cultural-linguistic and ecological problems.

We support, the speaker said, an addition to the draft CPSU platform so that the whole range of issues connected with such a delicate sphere as Soviet autonomy be specially revealed in an all-union law on Soviet autonomy at the new, historic stage of its development.

Among nationalities problems as a whole, the problems of language and the problem of improving language policy at the present stage occupy a special position. The knots of problems concerning interethnic relations cannot be undone without a revival of the role and prestige of mother tongues in the life of society. No one has any doubts now that the general line in language policy for the foreseeable future is the development of bilingualism—both national language-Russian and Russian—national language bilingualism.

The systematic development of nationalities issues within the general course of the strategy of perestroyka needs a mechanism for their daily management. The speaker fully supported the provisions in the report and CPSU platform on the need for the creation in the country of a well-proportioned organizational structure to manage the development of interethnic relations, the speaker noted.

[illegible] the platform's [illegible] Kaunas, first secretary of the CPSU oblkom on the Soviet autonomous oblast.

It is time we all understood, he said, that we are children of one great country, making what contributions we can to its development and to its well-being. There can be no

stepsons or outcasts within it, since that would contradict the principles of a humane and civilized society, let alone of the party of communists. It seems to me that in a situation where there is a very svetlyy approach by the media to the assessment of events and phenomena, and there are judgments which are often contradictory, it is very important to have the authoritative and principled opinion of the leadership of our party and of the members of the USSR politburo, Government and Supreme Soviet on the acute and burning issues of our life.

The delay in holding a real plenum of the Central Committee, by continuing, has damaged perestroyka. The Central Committee, Supreme Soviet and government of the country—and the working people have been saying this—must acknowledge that they bear part of the responsibility for the situation which has come about in the national sphere, a situation which is in some ways drastic. There has been a failure to make a timely and principled assessment of the development of national self-admission into national egoism. No relief has been given to departmentalism, regionalism, and tendencies toward national exclusivity. Chauvinistic and extremist actions have not been nipped in the bud.

It is desirable the speaker continued, to examine, taking into account the people's opinion, the question of changing the subordination [perepodchinenie] of all the autonomous objects of the republic and placing them directly under the authority of the organs of state power and administration of the Russian Federation. Another issue which needs to be thoroughly examined is that of the representations of the autonomous objects in the supreme organs of state power and RSFSR administration.

In conclusion the speaker drew attention to the following. The platform's draft proposes to establish a bureau of the CPSU Central Committee for the RSFSR, which was at one time abolished as an unnecessary and duplicating stage of party leadership. If we are to solve the question on autonomization of the Russian communists, then it is obvious that it is necessary to take a serious stand regarding the setting up of the Russian Communist Party and its Central Committee.

I.I.S. Shorshin, first secretary of Tuva obkom party committee, noted that overcoming difficulties and solving acute problems, especially social ones, is possible only along the paths of deepening perestroyka, creating efficient economy and better utilizing the opportunities which exist in the republic.

The speaker proposed that in the course of elaboration of the laws on local self-management and local economy more consideration should be given to the specific conditions of each territory and especially to the autonomous formations.

In the conditions when the nationality and interethnic problems are closely connected with psychology, people's social awareness, and with defining their relations toward representatives of other nations, the role of the party's ideological work based on firm ideological foundations, is growing as never before. Here special stress should be laid on forming in people's internationalist consciousness, he stressed.

Life shows that the growth of national self-consciousness of people itself is not accompanied with the growth of their internationalist consciousness. This quite often leads to the fact that a section of people shifts toward nationalism, to the position of national narrow-mindedness. The report speaks clearly about the responsibility of the communists for strengthening friendship between our peoples and for establishing mutual trust and respect between them. This concerns, in particular, leading workers in the national republics, said the speaker.

V.V. Bakatin, USSR minister for internal affairs, reported that during the 8 months of the current year the crime rate in the country has grown by 13.2 percent. There have been 1 916 000 crimes committed, including 213 000 seriously ones. This is an unprecedented increase, he said. Anyone expecting quick results and victories must be disappointed, this is impossible. At the same time measures are being taken.

With practically no increase in the number of personnel, the speaker noted, the organs and investigative organs have uncovered and investigated 24 7 000 more criminal cases in 8 months than last year.

As far as criminality due to interethnic conflicts, mass disorders, lawlessness and violence are concerned, the situation here is much less clear and, let us speak plainly, it is difficult to predict. During the present and past year in the course of interethnic disorders in the country 797 people were killed, 5 250 people were injured and thousands of homes were burnt and looted. 360 000 Armenians, Azerbaijanis, Meskhetian Turks and people of other nationalities were forced to leave their hearths. Each such conflict has its own reasons, its own face, its own executors, including, without question, also criminals. Its inspirers are the leaders of the "shadow economy" remaining in the shade, the mercenary criminal clans, etc.

Concerning all the mass disorders and interethnic conflicts which have taken place in these 2 years, the USSR Procuracy and the USSR MVD have instituted 1 138 cases, and so far 344 people have been handed over to the courts and judged by the courts. First of all, we are punishing the direct murderers and aggressors, but the organizers and inspirers, those who directly organized provoke and lead inflaming nationalism, unfortunately, remain practically unpunished.

Further, V.V. Bakatin touched on issues connected with the problems of Nagorno-Karabakh. In his opinion, a way out should be sought on the lines of compromise, not by redrawing the borders, but by meeting each other half way. If the Azerbaijan Communist Party and the Armenian Communist Party and their Central Committees are really playing a leading role and their authority

among their people then they should be given the opportunity of demonstrating internationalism in practice. If members of one and the same party, whose ideology and banner is internationalism, cannot come to an agreement between themselves, then it means that something here is not right. Here internal troops, I am deeply convinced, any troops, will be of no help.

The key to the solution of interethnic problems, underlined the speaker in conclusion, is in the economy, in the social sphere and in the quest for common spiritual and moral ideals and goals. But in the first place there must be a strengthening of the party.

The floor is given to V.M. Mishin, secretary of the All-Union Central Trades Union Council [AUCCTU]. The speaker said that one of the fundamental reasons for the exacerbation of interethnic relations was that in recent decades both the party as a whole and the union republics' party organs had lost from their field of vision the major political issue of the formation of ethnic detachments of the working class. The siting of production forces was quite erroneously determined by what were essentially technocratic trends in the economy, whilst sociodemographic and ethnic factors were totally ignored. Today it is the sociopolitical consequences of these decisions which were not always thought through, the transportation of a workforce to densely populated areas and the absence of planned work to involve the local able-bodied population in public production with which we are confronted.

Tucked up in the false theses of the growth of the social homogeneity of society, we practically aided the creation of many of the present focuses of interethnic tension. Major disproportions in the structure of employment of the population have been formed. It remains a fact that within many territories there exists an unspoken division of labor between the representatives of different nationalities.

In recent times, continued the speaker, attempts to oppose socialism with democracy, and use democracy against socialism have become noticeably more active. Voices have been heard saying that the very type of our society supposedly hinders the democratic solution of problems which have built up, including ethnic ones as well. Moreover, attacks are permitted on our working class, which is by its very nature internationalist, which has supposedly ceased to be the subject of social progress.

The party's primary obligation at the present stage is seen to be to help our working class to straighten its shoulders and overcome its political entrapment which, paradoxically, in my view, has been continuing to grow in a number of places even in the conditions of perestroyka.

Having fully supported the idea of the inadmissibility of federalism in the party, the speaker allied himself with the proposal to study deeply the issue of the possibility of the organizational creation within the framework of the CPSU of a Russian Communist Party. Such a creation, he said, will strengthen the unity of our ranks.

With this the discussion at the CPSU Central Committee plenum was ended.

The plenum heard a report from Aleksandr Sukharev, procurator general of the USSR on the results of the checking of the statements by Yegor Ligachev, who stressed two important circumstances.

First, he said, the numerous television appearances by the investigators Gdlyan and Ivanov, which contained hints and assertions on the alleged involvement of Ligachev in bribe taking, are completely unfounded.

Secondly, Gdlyan and Ivanov knew very well that they were not only grossly violating the elementary norms of investigative ethics and the presumption of innocency, but that they were spreading a dangerous lie they had fabricated themselves.

These conclusions are contained in the official documents of the investigation—the decision of 4 September 1989 on ending the case because no crime had taken place.

On what were these conclusions based? To answer this question, one must ask another. From where did Ligachev's name appear and why? On the basis of irrefutable information from the investigation, the following has been established. Ligachev's name was mentioned only by one of the accused being held in custody, I.B. Usmankhodzhayev, former first secretary of the Uzbekistan communist party Central Committee, in very mysterious, and actually now clear circumstances.

Usmankhodzhayev was arrested on 19 October last year. In as much as the investigation of the case of bribery in Uzbekistan by Gdlyan's group was dragging out, dozens of accused people were held in custody for years before going on trial, and the decision was taken by the management of the procuracy to speed up the investigation, all the more so since there was work ahead with four new accused at once.

Here the low professional quality of investigation in Gdlyan's group was taken into account. It showed up especially in the preparation of the charges in the case of Churbanov and other Gaff of the bodies of the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

For that reason, along with the workers from the investigative unit and the 200 investigators from outside already working on it, the most experienced procuracy staff from the main investigative directorate of the USSR Procuracy, the main military procuracy, and investigators from the Committee of State Security—on whose initiative the investigation into bribetaking in Uzbekistan was started in 1988—were brought in, as is done quite often.

Usmankhodzhayev's case was given to Comrade V.A. Tikhiy, head of the Main Investigative Directorate of the USSR Procuracy, and Comrade V.A. Rau, investigator

from the investigative department of the USSR KGB to handle. In his first interrogation Usmankhodzhayev completely denied receiving and giving bribes. He then showed these two investigators, and also G.P. Karakozov, the direct boss of Comrade Gidlyan and former head of the investigative unit, and N.V. Moskovtseva, an investigator from Gidlyan's group, from whom he had received bribes. This was 2 days after his arrest.

On Sunday, 23 October when as a general rule investigations are not conducted except in case of extreme necessity, Comrades Gidlyan and Moskovtseva visited Usmankhodzhayev and interrogated him: the names of individual leading workers in the party and apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee and of several heads of the procuracy (11 people in all—appear in the protocol of the interrogation, and then in the statement addressed to the procurator general. Next Comrade Ligachev's name appears in the statement of 25 October for the first time.

At the same time, Usmankhodzhayev sends yet another statement addressed to me as procurator general, which points out that Gidlyan is a competent man on corruption matters in Uzbekistan, that he knows all the intricacies of this affair and therefore he, Usmankhodzhayev, asks that this case be investigated only by Gidlyan, Ivanov, and their direct chief, Karakozov, whom he writes he absolutely trusts and that he will not give any serious testimony to any other investigators.

Not having registered properly and not having reported to the procurator general the statements addressed to him, Comrades T. Gidlyan and Moskovtseva once again carried out an interrogation of Usmankhodzhayev and obtained evidence about the alleged giving of two bribes of R30,000 each to Comrade Ligachev by him, without indicating the place, time and specific circumstances.

He gave the same evidence on 29 October to these investigators and to Comrade A.D. Vasilyev, deputy public prosecutor, who participated in this interrogation, having added that he supposedly handed over the first bribe in Tashkent in June 1984, when Comrade Ligachev participated in the work of the 16th Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan, and the second one in November of the same year on a study in the building of the CPSU Central Committee during his trip to Moscow in connection with the 60th anniversary of the founding of the republic, and the money was allegedly handed over in executive brief cases.

However, already on 1 November, at the next investigation on a wide range of charges, which have been presented, which was carried out without Gidlyan's participation by Vasilyev, deputy procurator general, and by Moskovtseva with the use of audio recording, Usmankhodzhayev renounced the evidence against Comrade Ligachev by stating that he did not give him money. He continued claiming this at subsequent interrogations where he had an opportunity to freely give any kind of evidence.

And so this version held out for five days.

On 8 March Usmankhodzhayev sent a statement by means of the administration of the solitary confinement and interrogation cell to the USSR public prosecutor, in which he informed him that he renounced his testimony containing the accusations against other staff members at the centre.

Taking into account this circumstance, as well as his insistent request regarding a meeting with the public prosecutor on 8 April 1989, he was interrogated by myself, by my deputy Comrade A.D. Vasilyev, and by the prosecutor, Comrade I.K. Titov.

At the interrogation Usmankhodzhayev stated that he had slandered the previously mentioned members of staff of the CPSU Central Committee, Comrades Ligachev, Kapitonov, Solomentsev, and some other persons.

At another interrogation on May 17 by the investigator of the examining group, S. Dukhanin, with the participation of Comrades A.D. Vasilyev and I.K. Titov, Usmankhodzhayev, speaking of the reasons that made him wittingly give false evidence, explained: "I was set a specific task by Gidlyan—to give evidence on the handing over of bribes to the members of the CPSU Central Committee staff, to staff of the law and order bodies, to frankly name some of them, in particular Solomentsev, Kapitonov, Mogilnichenko, Bessarabov, Smirnov, Ishkov, Terebilov, and some others."

When talking about the first interrogations, about their essence, he reported the following: "I was told by Karakozov, recommended by him, to name those from whom I had received bribes and to whom I had given them, and then they would not give me more than 8 years, and then with their help I might possibly even be pardoned. And I also named Orlov and Khudayberdyev, for them as people who gave me bribes. This never happened, and I did not take bribes from the above-mentioned people. All this was lies.

"Then I was told that, in connection with my behaviour, the investigation would involve my children. I don't recall that conversation in detail now, but it left a terrible impression on me. It became awful for me and my family."

Continuing his evidence, Usmankhodzhayev stated:

"I went back to the cell completely depressed. There was a guy there with me. He started to tell me that the investigators would be holding confrontations. 'They will beat us,' and therefore it is better to confess to a certain figure. At this point he cited the example of the sad plight of Ovchinov, who had, as it were, created intolerable conditions for himself because of his stubbornness and reluctance to confess. I do not know what they would do to me, and I hesitated. I couldn't understand what I was supposed to confess to. Eventually, I

came to the conclusion that I would have to sign the statement with the confession."

Usmankhodzhayev continues his evidence: "Gdlyan called me in. Concentrated psychological brainwashing went on for over 2 hours. It became clear to me that there are two ways to behave at an investigation—silence or confession. If I keep silent, then in that way I will make easier the job of the investigators who will then be free to cook up things which I found hard to even credit. 'If I like,' Gdlyan said, 'there can be 7 million bribes against you, if I like, there can be 5 million.' I can state here and now that I slandered Ligachev and many others because that was what was necessary to Gdlyan and Ivanov. I did not give these people any bribes. During the course of the investigation I tried several times to decline to give evidence of giving bribes to those in higher places, which I told Ivanov straight. Ivanov tried to persuade me not to renounce these 'people in high places.' He said that 'those higher up' were my salvation, my 'umbrella' and that I should hold on to them. Were it not for those 'in higher places,' my case would have been settled long ago."

In order to verify the authenticity of Usmankhodzhayev's evidence and the objectivity of the appraisal of it, an interrogation was carried out in the USSR Procurator's Office of Comrade Yu.K. Ligachev, who testified that he did indeed take part in June 1984 in the work of the 16th plenum of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, where he made a speech about the eradication of crude violations of the norms of party life and socialist legislation and the spread of bribe-taking and abuse in the republic. It was true that Usmankhodzhayev later came to Moscow and was at the CPSU Central Committee. Ligachev described Usmankhodzhayev's statement about money being handed to him as calumny and slander, because nothing of the kind ever occurred, that he had always been an opponent of gifts and presentations, even souvenirs, and had never given any one the slightest reason to doubt his integrity and honesty.

Under interrogation, Witness Maiyshev, a former security guard who was with Comrade Ligachev in Uzbekistan in June 1984, explained that Ligachev had no "executive brief-case" with him while he was there. And he categorically denied any possibility of its being handed over to Comrade Ligachev.

Witnesses Legostayev and Tzranov, who accompanied Comrade Ligachev on this trip, testified that the latter did not have any unofficial contacts, meetings, or conversations with the republican leadership in the absence of other persons. He received no souvenirs or gifts. They—as did witness Mikhaylov—stated that there had been no presentations to Comrade Ligachev from Usmankhodzhayev or other persons in Moscow either.

Thus, the information obtained from Usmankhodzhayev at the initial stage of the investigation was clearly false, the slander against Comrade Ligachev had been established, and in this connection the case in this section had been terminated in the absence of a corpus delicti.

The Procurator's Office, as you know, terminated the case too against Smirnov, former head of a section of the party-organization department of the CPSU Central Committee and later Second Secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee.

The verification, also by means of an inquiry, of a number of public statements by these investigators with regard to other leading personnel of central, party, and other bodies has virtually been completed.

I would not like today to anticipate the final decision of the inquiry. But I can say quite definitely and responsibly, based on authenticity and on documents of the trial, that in relation to these people the evidence was obtained by the same methods of blackmail and, to be blunt, fabrication.

Criminal proceedings have been instigated and are being carried out in connection with the numerous indications of violations of the law among the inquiry group headed by Gdlyan. There is no doubt that other questions connected with the responsibility of specific officials will also be investigated. The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the special commission set up by the Congress of People's Deputies will be informed about this.

Why have these proceedings been instigated? I will tell you, comrades, that apart from what you have already heard, the Procurator's Office has received hundreds of letters and statements, and not only from those who have been arrested and condemned, and their dear ones, but also from officials, war- and labor veterans and people's deputies with specific denunciatory facts about insults which have been perpetrated in the name of the law. People have been and still are reporting unlawful arrests and persecutions, the illegal confiscation of personal property, and the violation of labor and other rights of citizens.

All this must be carefully checked. It must be made clear to everyone that it is possible to probe deeply into the secrets of a single inquiry and violations which have been committed only by means of an inquiry with strict regard to professional norms.

Glaring instances of tyranny have already been established. Dozens of cases of unlawful detention and arrests of completely innocent citizens and their being held in captivity from several days to 9 months. There have been widespread cases of the arrest of whole families, elderly people, and mothers of many children. These actions have been used as an unlawful method of forcing people under interrogation to provide evidence vital to the investigation.

There was the case, among others, of Saidova Nora, a mother of 12 children, who was arrested along with her

husband and two sons. The children who were left free and other relatives were not even informed of their arrest.

Mukhamed Shamuzaf, a driver and father of six, was kept in custody without reason for 5 months and 20 days.

Evidence is given of physical violence being used against those detained, of personal degradation, and threats of reprisals against members of family and near ones. All this will be checked and rechecked.

There are also to be found—and I would particularly like to make this point—people, and quite a number of them, who have had the charges against them dropped by dubious means, and they are saying that from the outset the work of the investigation was programmed and aimed at extorting evidence about the bribery of executive personnel, including those in the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee. As a result these people were forced to write down false statements under dictation and prompted by the investigator to indicate sums of nonexistent bribes and the time and place they were handed over. A new theory about the duties of an accused to prove his guilt was, I suspect, placed at the service of this kind of lawlessness. What does it amount to? The person under interrogation slanders "those big ones up" and then, in order to justify the existence of large sources of cash or the giving of a bribe, slanders "those lower down"—his subordinates in the receiving of these bribes. As a result of the blackmail and threats they slandered themselves and others who allegedly were in the possession of valuables obtained by criminal means.

But in fact now and then they were giving to the investigators their savings or the money obtained from friends on receipt. We have received evidence of this kind as well as documents which were notarially testified. Let's say—that Citizens Aitmov, Polunyazov, and Beschasnov collected more than R500,000 from many friends and handed them as a "pay-off" to the investigators. Yes, I also pondered that I should try to get R500,000—as we know it is not so simple. But it turns out that it is possible. It is confirmed by the evidence of many, many dozens of witnesses who were themselves giving and who were themselves collecting money from others. They verify through documents that collection of this money occurred. The facts are becoming known of persuasions and bribes, of crude pressure on witnesses and persons under investigation in order to make them adhere to the testimony obtained in the course of investigation. We understand that in these calls, as well as in the pleadings of those who were arrested for taking bribes, can entail juggling of facts, untruth, the desire to vindicate oneself and avoid legal proceedings. Undoubtedly, we imagine all this. The juridical and prosecution practice quite often encounters attempts of this kind.

The Procuracy leadership and its investigators and prosecutors understand all the enormous importance of the issue of corruption. In the final analysis, the procuratory and state security bodies confiscated many millions [of rubles] from criminals. And we are doing everything to complete this investigation before the end of next month so that all those guilty of corruption receive their just deserts. We are doing this firmly, despite I have to say additional difficulties and suspicions cast on the investigation which have been created by Gdlyan and Ivanov through their statements and lawlessness. But we must not ignore a single appeal, petition, or complaint, no matter how dubious it may appear. For we are talking about people's destinies, their freedom, and their honor. We must remove suspicion from people if it is groundless and punish the guilty and give a conclusive reply to any citizen who asks for protection of his constitutional rights. That is the requirement of the law and in conditions of the shaping of a law-based state it must be observed particularly strictly. In this connection, one is amazed at the advice, even the requests which are being made to the leadership of the procurator's office to slow down or terminate altogether the inquiry which is in progress into the violations committed by Gdlyan's group of investigators.

We see no factual grounds or indications of the law which would permit such an incomprehensible step to be taken. On the contrary, people are demanding the speediest possible establishment of the truth and justice, and the publication of all the materials and decisions which are due to be taken by the judiciary bodies. Comrades, I cannot help but mention the position which has now been adopted by Comrades Gdlyan and Ivanov on all these questions. You will already know a great deal from their own statements in the mass media and at numerous meetings. I will say clearly that as far as those in the Procurator's Office are concerned, this position arouses not only amazement but indignation, too. And this was also indicated by the open party meeting in the USSR Procurator's Office which was held recently.

Members of the party Central Committee should know that it is these investigators themselves who have created the problem around which public passions are now being inflamed. Claiming to be the only fighters against the Mafia, and taking advantage of years of connivance on the part of the leadership of the Procurator's Office, they have virtually been doing as they liked, without regard for service discipline, the norms of professional ethics, or the law.

Making use of a wide open public platform, they have launched unprecedented attacks on the Supreme Court and have instigated and are continuing an adventurist propaganda fuss in order to compromise the political leadership, to disorientate the population and at the same time gain political capital. In doing so they are stubbornly shying away from a professional dialogue with the jurists. We, the whole apparatus and the whole collegium, urge them to undertake such a dialogue within the course of half a year. Evidently it is the "justice" of meetings which is more to their liking. Foreseeing complete exposure, Gdlyan and Ivanov recently staked their all, so to speak. They began to

speak without any evidence about certain criminal decisions by the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee. Without any grounds whatsoever they are now describing as heroes specific individuals from among the former and current political leadership—although—and I say this again and again—there is absolutely nothing even remotely like the truth in all this. And these communists are now taking their arrant nonsense on to foreign radio stations. I wouldn't be surprised, comrades, if tomorrow we hear about new irresponsible outbursts, sensations, and falsifications.

For many months now, while doing nothing at all in the Procurator's Office, covered by their deputy's mandate, they are scurrying about the towns and villages, working people up, even taking to the boards in the theater. They are endlessly intriguing local residents about allegedly denunciatory material which they possess but which for some reason they have chosen for many long months not to show to the judiciary bodies or the Congress commission.

But as jurists and investigators, they of course cannot help but know that any deliberate concealment of the materials of an inquiry is, if you like, a crime against the law. So what? They must be responsible. It is also surprising that there are people speaking at these meetings who are sympathetic toward them. There are sound people, but people who have not had time even to talk to the leaders of the Procurator's Office and acquire elementary knowledge as to the true state of affairs. Comrades, there are also many party committees who are giving unconcernedly in the provocative intrigue of these investigators and their emissaries. Such an attitude only plays into the hands of the adventurers.

Clearly, the question about which I am speaking today goes beyond the bounds of a specific—albeit, of course, major—matter. For we are talking about a crucial problem of building a law-based state and about lawfulness in all spheres of life in which previously we were lacking. [passage omitted] reporting on speech by Ye. Ligachev, this passage appeared separately in the 22 September edition of the Soviet DAILY REPORT on page 59]

The floor is given to I. Smirnov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee.

A question of fundamental importance, the speaker said, which is a logical continuation of the discussion of M.S. Gorbachev's report and of the speeches which have already been heard, has been put forward for our attention and examination. T. Sukharev has just given a report on the result of the examination of the materials slandering Ye.K. Ligachev. The USSR Procurator has confirmed the absurdity of the accusation against him.

The attacks which have greatly intensified recently against the party, its leaders, and its representatives in the regions are not at all as ineffensive as some people think. The thousand-times repetition of a lie and particularly of a half-truth leaves a noticeable trace in people's hearts and minds. What lies behind this lack of moral standards? Inability to enjoy the benefits of openness and glasnost? The usual cultural shortcomings? Or a very deliberate attempt and even a policy of imposing on us a new style of public attitudes—to create their own psychological and organizational structure? It is natural to me. I can't evade the cornucopia of lengthy interviews which Gdlyan and Ivanov gave for our press and the foreign press, television and radio, the impassioned speeches at meetings, rallies, soirees, and even rock concerts, as happened recently, in the Crimea. Their leitmotif is always one and the same: it was not at all the CPSU Central Committee but precisely they who initiated the fight against the evil in society. It is they alone and no one else who are conducting the dangerous and unequal struggle against the reactionaries and bureaucrats who are allegedly entrenched in the party.

Many people would like to have nothing to do with them. It will all sort itself out, they say, and there is no need to take on unnecessary worries. But everything is more complicated than that. What we have here is a phenomenon which is clearly observable in the country's public-political existence. The party has a well-known policy of adopting the most resolute measures against organized crime, bribe-takers, profiteers, against any infringement on citizens' property and dignity. And so in carrying out their duties, they have for some time given priority to "sensational" statements, to unsubstantiated accusations, to fabrications on a whole range of criminal cases, and to methods of provocation. And they have subordinated all of this to the achievement of their far-reaching political and careerist aims.

What can be more dangerous for legality and the legal foundations of the state which we are creating? Does this not compromise the investigator, the central figure in the law-enforcement mechanism? does it not torpedo perestroika itself? And do we have any assurance against a recurrence if the public remains silent? And all the more so since particularly in recent months they have been given wide-ranging opportunities to whip up psychosis and tension. Those who are not in agreement with them or who are defamed by them can only content themselves with indignant statements, angry retorts, or messages at meetings. Even in the narrow, regional mass media their material, unlike the statements by Gdlyan and Ivanov, is not given access to the papers or to television.

That is why it seems one should no longer brush aside Gdlyan's "opinion." To my mind it reflects certain common tendencies within restructuring itself. It has come to be a mirror of the times, albeit a distorting one, in the same way as Gdlyan himself has come to be a sign of the phenomenon known as "skorosheev" [zaytsevshchina].

Gdlyan everywhere employs the word "we" constantly demonstrating that for him it is not the usual pathetic formula which has lost its own individual face, but a fully concrete and quite precise definition of those who think like him. In his numerous utterances, Gdlyan re-

addition to the emphasis on "we" experience the thought that the the most important thing is that precisely "we" ourselves should not waver, should not let the "cause" fall into other hands. They do not even make any secret of their group confrontation vis-a-vis all those who, incidentally, are actively participating in perestroyka. Here too, the "skirmishers" [zastrelshchiki] feel they have a monopoly, imagining, far from naively, that they can actually push experienced cadres and the aktiv back by "poking them off" one by one, with lavish use of menacing labels such as, in the worst case, "enemies of perestroyka."

Inasmuch as it is Gdlyan and Ivanov who have been the most energetic and impudent of the "skirmishers," I have concentrated your attention on them. The more so since they, in revving up their extremist political struggle, are increasingly often putting into service any old slander and any old absurdity, anything to make their attacks more sonorous and more trenchant, on the principle: "sling as much mud as possible—washing it off is not our concern."

While loudly and publicly offering prayers to the search for truth, they are in fact forever perjuring themselves, uttering calumnies and constantly telling less than the whole story, either hushing up the facts or distorting them, making provocative statements about bribetaking in relation to Comrades Ligachev, Solomentsev, Ryzhkov, Terebilov, Lukin, Manasseev, Zakharov, and many other leading figures of the party and state. To say nothing of those in the next rank down. I myself remain the target of constant dirty insinuations, having become an obstacle in their criminal path; refused to slander honest men and categorically rejected the monstrous dirty accusations fabricated against me. They are still doing everything they can, by shaping public opinion in a distorting way, to leave me once again, in Ivanov's expression "on pawn" [v zaklade], thereby also blackmailing others, and to go on discrediting the apparat of the Central Committee and the party as a whole.

But I am not what matters. What matters is the global scale on which the experiment of the thirties to fifties is being repeated. From time immemorial the members of "advance-guard" [avangardnyy] have had their dossiers. Even in the hands of Vyshinskiy's investigators, these dossiers contained materials based on the principle of objective imputation. For the most part they rested on self-slander and calumny against others. The method used to obtain such "testimony" is physical and psychological terror and blackmail. Now people are once again beginning to fear the repetition of the knock on the door at night and the far from light hand of certain "warriors of righteousness," who have for the purpose of defamation practically unimpeded access to the media, which reach millions of people.

This mechanism is worthy of study and, above all, of a well-argued and principled rebuff. Now, as has always happened at times of sudden change, there are not a few "skirmishers" who have ridden out ahead in the rush to grab a piece of the cake and a share of the glory at all costs and at any price. Some are also in a hurry to forget the initiative and courage of the party in implementing perestroyka and are trying, when a convenient occasion offers itself, to cast a shadow over it. Moreover, by dint of its leading, advance-guard role in society.

If what we are standing up for is not half of the truth, but the whole truth, then it is very important at the present time to speak openly to the people of the way certain adepts are striving, by degrees, to create for themselves a colorful image as "fighters for the truth." In the history of a society all the elements are interconnected. Any imposed cult is always fraught with retribution. All of this merits conscientious and profound interpretation in the light of historical experience.

The fight for popularity, the speaker noted in conclusion, is a tried and tested mechanism of political struggle, abroad also. As is its reverse side, the discrediting of one's opponents. The time of perestroyka has given us an opportunity to convince ourselves of our mettlesome ability to copy and use "abroad" even in this sphere. Gdlyan's dictate "extremes" in a journal published in Munich is a brilliant example of this. It is impossible to close one's eyes any longer to the fact that the figure of the false "skirmisher" in its abusive rage is unable or unwilling to look at the root and therefore to foresee the results of its destructive actions, which do not accord with the decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet "on a resolute intensification of the fight against crime." Their exposure is a necessity. Otherwise we cannot defend perestroyka or defend the legitimate rights and interests of the freedom of every one of us.

After examination of an organizational question, the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee concluded its work.

Medvedev Reports to CPSU Plenum 20 Sep

LD2509111789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 22 Sep 89

[Account of report by V.A. Medvedev, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary, to CPSU Central Committee plenum on 20 September]

[Text] Comrade Medvedev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, made a report to the plenum on the work of the editorial commission on the amendments it proposes to the text of the CPSU platform on the nationalities question. Each of these amendments was discussed. Here is a fragment of this discussion.

[Begin recording] [Medvedev] On page 12, third paragraph from the top, it is proposed at the end of this paragraph that the second sentence of this paragraph should read thus: Such participation is ensured by the representation of each union republic in the organs of the

[USSR and also by the establishment of special procedures, the elaboration and adoption of union-wide decisions—period. And omit the words, affecting the interests of the union republics, because the previous version restricts the range of questions in which the union republics take part in solving.

[Gorbachev] We adopt the position that there must be a priority for the union law and the republican law in order to put an end to the constant clashes on this basis, when the union engages upon what should be tackled by the republic in anything.

[Medvedev] Mikhail Sergeyevich, the matter under discussion here is the participation of the union republics in the resolution not only of those questions which fall within the competence of the republics, but the participation in resolving questions which are of union concern.

[Gorbachev] Of the union—they are also involved.

[Medvedev] For there are questions which involve not only the interests of the republics, as was written previously.

[Gorbachev] True, true.

[Medvedev] But all questions within all-union competence.

[Gorbachev] All the same, this issue is combined.

[Medvedev] Page 11.

[Gorbachev] Which page?

[Medvedev] Page 11, paragraph 3. The Editorial Commission discussed this paragraph in great detail and very heatedly. As a result the following version is proposed in place of the one in the draft.

[Gorbachev] The one about land and minerals.

[Medvedev] Land and minerals, timber, water, and other natural resources are the joint property of the Union Republic and of the USSR. Each union republic has a law on the use of natural resources adopted on the basis of union-wide fundamentals of legislation on this issue.

[Gorbachev] You know, the discussion of this matter went on for a long time in the Editorial Commission. Although this formulation, even though it has undergone, so to say, all the discussion, omits to say that the republic is the owner, along with the union, moreover, virtually from the start of this joining together into a union. [sentence as heard] That is, first the republic was named and then the union as a result of the unification of these republics. And then [as printed] ...and only from here could there be talk of possession and making use of what the owner possesses. So, from the start it is necessary to stress that the earth's minerals are the joint property of the republic and the union. What about it, comrades? [sounds of approval from hall] This was discussed for a long time in the commission. Good. [end recording]

Kotsemskiy Addresses CPSU Plenum 20 Sep

LD2709154789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Excerpt of speech by B.I. Kotsemskiy, first secretary of the Jewish Autonomous Oblast CPSU Committee at CPSU Central Committee plenum in Moscow Kremlin on 20 September—recorded]

[Text] As everywhere else in the country, we, too, have a number of difficulties in the cause of implementing the national and cultural requirements of the population. It is precisely these problems that are in the center of our attention. It is precisely upon their implementation that the destiny of the oblast and its future depend. We try to do a lot. The state of affairs with regard to housing, passenger services, and food is improving too slowly—priority is being given to the countryside. At the same time, one can quote arguments which bear witness to the oblast lagging behind in a whole range of most important indicators—lagging behind Khabarovsk Kray, of which we are a part, in the economic and social development and lagging behind the republic—but, I think, there is no need for that.

One thing is clear: that for as long as we fail to create for the people the necessary conditions, for as long as we fail to eliminate the disproportions and problems that have piled up in the development of the oblast, it is impossible to hope that cadres will flow in and stay put.

In accordance with the Politburo instruction and taking into account the fact that the Jewish Autonomous Oblast does not figure as a national-territorial entity within the program of development of productive forces of the Far Eastern economic region, we have submitted to the country's government proposals concerning a balanced and comprehensive development of the economy and the social sphere. Their implementation will make it possible to create good scientific and technical potential to improve the conditions of life of the people, to make the oblast intellectually attractive, to satisfy the already coming petitions to have Jewish families resettled.

Our proposals have met with Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's support. The USSR and the RSFSR state planning committees, ministries, and departments, however, are slow to examine them. Some of them reject what has been proposed. Time does not stand still, while the problems affecting the enterprises of the light and mining industries, the agro-industrial complex, agricultural machine building, and electrotechnical engineering enterprises and the construction materials industry continue to get worse. The USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification has still failed to take effective measures to step up the work on constructing power engineering facilities. In the meantime, the shortage of the heating power in the oblast center will already reach 17 percent of the power input this winter.

The exacerbation of the economic crisis has aggravated to the extreme the problem of provision of consumer

goods. Against this backdrop social divisions, instability, and lack of confidence in the future have powerfully made themselves felt. Forces that speculate on these difficulties, that call for civil disobedience, toward the authorities, for staging demonstrations and strikes are becoming more active in this situation.

The last thing they are thinking about is the interests of our people. They gamble with power, making cheap political capital and coming out against the party and its leading role in perestroyka. We have also turned out to be complacent in the face of the frenzied attacks launched by petit-bourgeois elements, in the face of consumer cosmopolitanism and freeloading attitudes which have literally submerged entire regions.

Nor do we regard as correct the government's decision aimed at satisfying the strikers' demands for consumer goods. People ask: How are we worse than others? Indeed, is it possible to put resources from one area into another? After all, the state has only one economic cake to divide—the thinner it becomes the greater the estrangement among the people due to all manner of causes.

I think that the government ought to comprehensively consider and tell the people the truth about this: are we, in today's conditions, able to do without rationing of specific goods? If we are not, this means we must think about adopting a decision, to remain in force over a predetermined period of time, affecting the territory of the entire country, a decision taking account of the principle of justice rather than of the level of funds that obtain in various regions. Then the population will not feel irritated, there will not be grievances addressed to the local party bodies about failures to supply specific goods.

CPSU Plenum Adopts Draft Nationalities Policy

PM270ct89 Moscow *PRAVDA* in Russian
24 Sep 89 First Edition pp 1-2

["Draft Nationalities Policy of the Party Under Present Conditions (CPSU Platform), adopted by the CPSU Central Committee Plenum, 20 September 1989" — PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The nationalities question in the Soviet Union has become exceptionally acute recently. The party is aware that the solution of the problems which have arisen in this connection is of enormous significance for the destiny of perestroyka and the future of our country. This solution can and must be found only within the mainstream of the revolutionary renewal of Soviet society. Key importance on this plane will attach to the transformations which are being effected at the present stage of the reform of the economic and political system of socialism in the USSR. Principled approaches toward the solution of this task are contained in the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference resolution "on interethnic relations."

With the holding of the USSR People's Deputies first congress and the subsequent formation of new union republican and local organs of power a political mechanism is taking shape within whose framework the solution of the urgent questions of the development of all the peoples of our country and interethnic relations is unfolding. The USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of Nationalities and its commissions are called on to make a special study of these questions.

The CPSU considers it essential to define as one of the most important components of the overall concept of perestroyka the party's present policy on the nationalities question, which, with a commitment for Soviet and world experience, would ensure conditions for the free development of all peoples of our country and the consolidation of their friendship and cooperation on the basis of the principles of the organic combination of the equal rights of nations and the peoples and the equal rights of every citizen irrespective of nationality.

The proposed guidelines are the result of the analysis and comparison of the opinions of party committees, several regular scientific conferences, the broad public, and various public movements, academic and press circles. It is the result of the consideration of new ideas put forward at the congress of USSR People's Deputies. It is also the reflection of the opinions of Soviet people of different nationalities contained in letters sent to the CPSU Central Committee.

The Legacy Passed On to Us

To understand the correctness and importance of what has been done since the years of Soviet power you must bear in mind the premises from which our development started. There was virtually no industrial production over enormous expanses, especially in national regions, and whole strata of national and especially of world culture remained inaccessible to the people's masses. Many peoples were on the feudal or even patriarchal-clan stage of social development. Social inequality was aggravated by national oppression.

After the victory of the October Revolution the Soviet authorities embarked on the implementation of a socialist program on the nationalities question, a program elaborated by the party. It revolved around the ideas of national self-determination and the working people's international cooperation put forward by V.I. Lenin.

The formation of the USSR proceeded in a keen political struggle. Various approaches appeared toward the country's future national and state structure. It is to V.I. Lenin's credit that at the time he succeeded in discarding extremes. The proposal for a confederation, that is a structure which did not make it possible to pool the efforts and potential of the young Soviet republics to attain common goals and the project of "autonomization" which undermined the independence of national-state formations and was in fact aimed at forming a particularly centralized and unitary state.

The unification of the republics was achieved on the basis of a soviet federation which enabled the peoples, on the one hand, to implement the right to self-determination and the creation of their own statehood and, on the other, to use the advantages stemming from the pooling of their efforts and joint development along a socialist path.

Many nations resurrected or created for the first time their own statehood and various forms of national-territorial autonomy. The formation of the union socialist state on the basis of the 1922 Treaty and the 1924 Constitution made it possible through joint efforts to implement the country's industrialization and the socialist reorganization of the countryside, aiming at eliminating the backwardness of outlying districts and equalizing the peoples' levels of economic development and material provision. An integral national economic complex took shape. The social structure of the Soviet nations underwent a qualitative change. In the spiritual sphere opportunities were created for preserving and developing national individuality. At the same time integration processes proceeded conditioned both by economic needs and the unity of aims and ideals which objectively led to the formation of a new social community—the Soviet people.

All this served as the basis for gradually overcoming the former hostility and distrust and for shaping the friendship of the peoples. This friendship's strength and firmness were fully revealed in the Patriotic War, when Soviet people came to the defense of the freedom and independence of their multinational motherland and together won the victory over fascism.

Despite all the contradictions of subsequent development, the peoples' economic, social and spiritual progress proceeded unswervingly. Large production forces were formed in all regions of the country. The republics developed their own working class and scientific, technical, and artistic intelligentsia. The appearance of the countryside was transformed on the basis of the cooperative movement and mechanization. There was a sharp improvement in all Soviet peoples' standard of education. As a result of the industrial and agricultural development of the North, Siberia, and the Far East, and the creation of new industrial, scientific, and cultural centers, the country's national map changed. Today there is no territory where people of different nationalities do not live and work together. The demographic situation, characterized by the rapid growth of the urban population, has changed.

These deep changes led to new realities which must be considered both with a view to creating conditions for the further development of each national community and with a view to harmonizing interethnic relations. Hence the objective need for a radical renewal of nationalities policy.

At the same time the problems of national development and interethnic relations which the country is encountering right now also have deep roots in the past. It is essential to look into this and to resolutely oppose everything which does not accord with socialist ideals and principles.

The impulses which the proletarian revolution gave the nationalities policy have not faded throughout our entire history. But the deformations of social development which began soon after V.I. Lenin have also had a pernicious effect on interethnic relations.

The administrative edict system, which needed extremely centralized, uniform structures, ignored the needs of national development more and more as time went on. The departmental, bureaucratically mediocre approach prevailed, and this affected everything—from the siting of production forces to problems of language, education, and culture. On the pretext of protecting statewide interests, the autonomy of the republics was restricted and the unitarian trend gained strength. The demarcation of the competence of the union and the republics laid down in the 1924 Constitution was gradually eroded, and the republics' sovereignty became largely formal.

One major cause of the exacerbation of national problems was the mass repressions, in particular the resettlement of entire peoples from their traditional places of residence to other republics and regions. This was the fate of the Kalmyks, Karachai, Balkarians, Chechens, Ingush, Crimean Tatars, Meskhetian Turks, Germans, Koreans, Greeks, and Kurds. Many party and state workers in the republics and representatives of the national intelligentsia were groundlessly accused of nationalism and persecuted. All the peoples without exception suffered tragic losses in the personality cult period.

Although the decisions in question were condemned and revoked after the 20th congress, it was not possible in every case to eliminate the consequences of the lawlessness which was allowed. The existence of those problems is being felt to this day.

Many acute problems of the present day were generated by the contradictions of industrial economic development itself and by disregard for its social and ecological consequences. Great damage was inflicted on people's sense of nationality by the predominance of the sector principle of management and the associated departmentalism, as a result of which national conditions and traditions, ecological consequences, and the interests of comprehensive territorial development were not always taken into account. And for a long time republican, krai, and oblast organs themselves tolerated the unbalanced development of industrial potential.

The present problems in interethnic relations are associated to a significant degree with the underestimation of real social processes. The objective contradictions common to the whole world in the second half of the

20th century: between the development of nations and their rapprochement; between the desire for autonomy and the need to deepen the links of integration. Has had its effect in our multinational country too. But it was not properly analyzed or taken into account in policy.

The growth of national self-awareness aroused interest in the history of one's people and their cultural values and traditions. However the satisfaction of these needs was hampered by theoretical directives on the accelerated rapprochement of the nations and the assertion that the nationalities question had been fully and finally resolved, which led in practice to the belittling of national diversity and the peculiarities of spiritual life.

The demographic, economic and social processes that have taken place in recent decades have in a number of regions substantially changed the correlation between the indigenous population and the population that has settled there as a result of immigration, and this has aroused misgivings as to the preservation of national uniqueness. Furthermore, rapid mechanical population growth has created additional difficulties of a social nature and adversely affected the national structure of the working class. In other regions, with a large natural population growth, a shortage of jobs has arisen. All this has also created interethnic tension.

All the country's peoples, including the Russian people, have sustained damage as a result of violations of the Leninist principles of nationalities policy. Today in Russia, too, which was and remains the consolidating principle of our entire Union, and which made a decisive contribution to the elimination of the backwardness of outlying national districts, there are also many acute socioeconomic problems and problems of ecology, the tasks of the rescue and restoration of historical monuments, and the preservation of national cultural assets.

Indifference toward national uniqueness and the failure to resolve many social problems had a painful effect on national consciousness and generated a sense of grievance, which was not infrequently exploited in order to whip up the situation, and which created a fertile soil for national extremism. All this rendered national problems in a number of regions of the country explosive, and meant that the contradictions accumulated here became incorporated in the perestroyka process that has begun.

At present Soviet society, which has embarked on a path of radical reform, is critically reinterpreting its past. The task is, while preserving everything of value, to eliminate injustice, inject new energy into the economic, political, and spiritual life of every people of our country, and open up scope for free national development, and at the same time, to foster and augment the international unity of the socialist society and strengthen the multinational soviet state. The harmonization of interethnic relations on a new basis is one of the main goals of the party's nationalities policy.

How do the strategic tasks and basic guidelines for nationalities policy appear in this context?

Socialism, among other key characteristics, presupposes the equality of the rights of peoples, each of which should have the real potential to preserve its autonomy and uniqueness, language, culture and traditions. Today a most important task is to create effective state, social and economic mechanisms that will ensure the organic combination of national and international values and interests.

This task is inseparable from perestroyka in economic, social and political relations; it can only be resolved through the democratization of Soviet society and the establishment of the people's socialist self-management. Here the following avenues of nationalities policy come to the fore:

—the improvement of the Soviet federation and its investment with real political and economic content;

—the expansion of the rights and potential of all types of national autonomous units;

—the safeguarding of equal rights for every people and the satisfaction of the specific interests of every nationality;

—the creation of the conditions for the free development of national languages and cultures;

—the strengthening of guarantees to rule out the infringement of citizens' rights on the grounds of nationality;

—the renewal of all ideological, political, scientific research, and educational work in the sphere of national relations;

—the affirmation in interethnic communication of mutual respect for the historical traditions and specific national characteristics and the consideration of each people's economic and spiritual interests.

How To Improve the Soviet Federation and Render It Fully Valid [subheadword]

Since April 1985 a program of reforms in the economic, political, and other spheres of public life has been implemented in our country. The entire course of the country's development leads to the conclusion that there is a need for radical transformations in the Soviet federation.

The guarantee of our federation's durability is the completely voluntary nature of the association of the Soviet republics in a single union state, in which each republic retains its sovereignty and autonomy and takes part in the elaboration and adoption of common decisions. Exceptional importance is attached to the position of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which came out in favor of the restoration of the Leninist principle of national self-determination in its true sense, which should be safeguarded by appropriate democratic legal guarantees.

Attempts to claim that the self-determination of the USSR's peoples did not exist and to reduce it merely to secession [otdeleniye], thereby impoverishing this universal principle of the solution of the nationalities question, are futile. All Soviet and world experience demonstrates the need to view self-determination as more than just a unique act connected with the exercise of the right to secession. This is a complex, multilayered process of the affirmation of national dignity, the strengthening of political and economic autonomy, and the development of language and culture.

In present-day conditions this principle is expressed best in the kind of self-management which ensures the preservation of national identity and the right of each people to enjoy all the benefits of sovereignty and to independently resolve its development questions. At the same time, self-management presupposes the voluntary association of the republics and national formations for the sake of resolving the tasks common to all.

Consistently upholding the principle of self-determination, the CPSU sees it as the priority policy task to ensure the satisfaction of the diverse needs of all the Soviet nations through a renewed federation by investing it with new political and economic content, so that each nation receives wide opportunities for developing its economy and culture with the support of the national economic complex and scientific and cultural potential created in our country. And also to ensure that this policy leads to the international cohesion of the Soviet peoples and the strengthening of the USSR.

There is enormous potential inherent in the Soviet federation, and it is important to utilize it to the full.

The optimum correlation between the rights of the union republics and the USSR as a whole is a condition of the stability and successful development of our federation. In this context, several key issues come to the fore, on which an agreed solution should be found. First. The main idea at the basis of the Soviet federation is expressed in the generally recognized formula: Without a strong union there are no strong republics, without strong republics there is no strong union.

In accordance with this, it is necessary to clearly define the competency and mutual commitments of the union and the republics.

The union should be assigned the legislative powers necessary for establishing the fundamentals of the political and economic system and developing it, ensuring the country's defense and security, pursuing foreign policy, coordinating and resolving common tasks in the sphere of the economy, science and culture, ensuring and protecting the rights of the individual, utilizing integration processes efficiently, and organizing mutual assistance. The union should also be assigned the powers necessary for ensuring the dynamic and stable development of the country's national economic complex. The list of the USSR's powers must be exhaustive in character. Here it is expedient to proceed from the following:

—All rights appropriate to the status of the union republics as sovereign socialist states which are members of a federation belong to them. They are empowered to resolve all questions of state and public life with the exception of those that they voluntarily transfer to the union.

—A union republic takes part in the solution of questions which are within the jurisdiction of the USSR. Such participation is ensured by the representation of each union republic in the organs of the USSR as well as by the establishment of special procedures for the elaboration and adoption of all-union decisions.

—The USSR publishes the fundamentals of legislation and the laws of the USSR, which have equal force throughout the territory of the USSR and are given concrete form in the republics' legislation.

—If a union law goes beyond the powers of the union, the republics have the right to raise the question of its revocation; a republican law that goes beyond the limits of the republic's competence or is contrary to the law of the USSR is also subject to revocation.

—The highest representative organs of power of the union republics may protest and suspend the operation of resolutions and directives of the union government on their territory, if they violate the constitutional rights of the union republic.

—Within the framework of the federal rule-of-law state, mechanisms are being created and precise procedures laid down for resolving disagreements that may arise between the organs of power and management of the USSR and the republics, and also between union republics and other state-national and national-territorial formations. This function could be fulfilled first of all by the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee and, where necessary, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

—An important role in improving our federation and expanding the rights of union and autonomous republics is played by their constitutions, which are designed to reflect socioeconomic, cultural, and other characteristics of the republics and their historical traditions and should not contradict the constitution of the USSR.

Second. The economic content of self-determination and sovereignty in present-day conditions is expressed in the transition of the republics to economic accountability and self-financing. In accordance with this:

—Union republics adopt laws on the use of natural resources on the basis of the all-union fundamentals of legislation on this question, proceeding from the premise that the land, its minerals, timber, water, and other natural resources are the property of the union republic and the USSR.

—For the purposes of the precise definition of rights and responsibility on questions of ownership and use of

property, the affiliation of industrial, transport, agricultural, trade, municipal and other enterprises should be defined according to specific forms of social ownership. Union-wide, republican (of union and autonomous republics), municipal, cooperative or ownership of social organizations, labor collectives, joint stock companies and other economic societies.

—Alongside ownership by the union and the republics, enterprises may exist that are in joint union-republican ownership, as well as mixed forms of ownership, including forms involving foreign capital. The right to enjoyment, ownership, and use of such property, including its alienation, belongs to two or more republics.

—The choice of economic methods and forms of economic activity is made by the republics autonomously on their own territories, proceeding from the actual level of the socialization of production and the structure of production forces, taking account of the principles of economic efficiency and social justice and the need for the full employment of the population.

—In the framework of the development of the union-wide market, the conditions of economic exchange between enterprises and organizations and also between republics must be determined on a contractual basis. The republics autonomously select one form or another of economic accountability [khozraschet]. It is expedient to examine the possibility of establishing several such forms which correspond to the specific characteristics of the union republics and are differentiated according to the degree of economic autonomy. The nature and forms of deductions into the all-union budget and reciprocal accounting must be structured in accordance with these differences.

—The country must have a system of economic levers and incentives which enables the USSR government on the basis of the efficient use of state budget resources to pursue in conjunction with the union republics a purposeful line aimed at eliminating the lag in the economic development of individual regions due to objective factors, and also to create an all-union fund to provide aid to regions affected by natural disasters or ecological catastrophes, and in the development of new territories.

—The consolidation of the republics' economic autonomy and the growth of the national economic potential as well as the enhancement of their well-being are inseparable from the process of the deepening of specialization, economic integration, the full utilization of the benefits of the single market, and the buildup of the overall scientific and technical potential.

—An important task of the union organs is to promote a situation whereby the republics can pool their efforts and means on a bilateral or multilateral basis for the implementation of joint projects, and can create inter-republican commissions for economic, scientific and technical and cultural cooperation. [illegible]. The question of citizenship is closely bound up with the republic's sovereignty. According to the principles of socialist federalism it should be acknowledged that each union republic has its own citizenship which extends to all its inhabitants. A citizen of a union republic is simultaneously a citizen of the USSR. Privileges of any kind for some Soviet citizens and the infringement of the rights of other Soviet citizens on ethnic, religious, and ligurtic grounds, on the grounds of length of residence, as well as others which violate human rights is inadmissible.

[illegible]. When joining the USSR, the republics handed over to the jurisdiction of the central organs the implementation of the basic tasks of the country's foreign policy. At the same time, they still retain that inalienable feature of sovereignty—the right to maintain relations with foreign states and international organizations.

In the immediate future the constitutional processes should be realized whereby the USSR must establish the overall procedure and implement the coordination of the foreign policy and foreign trade activity of the union republics including their sending of delegations and permanent representatives to states with which they maintain economic and cultural ties. The republics' foreign ties must not conflict with all-union interests.

[illegible]. One of the main aims of the association of republics into the union lies in ensuring the security of the country, and the peaceful labor of the Soviet people. The republics make their contribution to the solution of these tasks by union bodies. The USSR Armed Forces are formed on a multinational basis, all citizens regardless of national affiliation must perform military service in accordance with the all-union laws. The union bodies by agreement with the republic authorities reserve the right to organize defense installations on the republics' territories (airfields, training centers, ranges, and so forth) and to use these.

[illegible]. In accordance with the transformation of the Soviet federation, the questions of the status and activity of social organizations playing an important part in the political system of the USSR arise in a new way.

Under conditions of the democratization process taking place in the country, a choice of forms of ties between the social organizations of the republics and of the union belongs to these same organizations.

The solution of this issue as applicable to the party is of very important political significance. The CPSU emerged as an organization of kindred spirits, as an association of progressive representatives of the working class and of the working people regardless of their national affiliation. It is precisely to its international nature that the party is obliged for the fact that it has been able to become the consolidating and leading force for the development of society along the socialist path.

—To accelerate the renewal of constitutional and other legislative acts on the autonomous republics and autonomous oblasts and okrugs.

—Taking into account the legal nature of the autonomous republics as Soviet socialist states, it is necessary to substantially broaden their competence. They should have the opportunity to resolve all questions of administrative and territorial division on their territories, nature protection, the development of national culture and language, and the protection of historical monuments.

—To strengthen the economic independence of autonomous republics by switching them to economic accountability and self-financing and determining forms whereby enterprises and associations under union and republic jurisdiction can participate in drawing up their budgets.

—To enable autonomous republic organs of power to protest acts passed by USSR and union republic administrative organs if they run counter to the constitutionally enshrined powers of the USSR or a union republic.

—To enhance the legal status of autonomous oblasts and okrugs, granting them the right of legislative initiative to the supreme organs of USSR and union republic state power as well as the right to have representation not only in the USSR Supreme Soviet but also in the Supreme Soviets of union republics and in the Soviets of People's Deputies of the relevant krays and oblasts.

—To establish that autonomous okrug organs of power can deal directly with USSR ministries and departments and union republic administrative organs, and to introduce the rule that decisions made by an okrug soviet can only be rescinded by a union republic Supreme Soviet. To stipulate that the territory of an autonomous oblast or okrug cannot be altered without their consent.

—To examine the question of the possibility of, and the procedure for, making the RSFSR's autonomous oblasts, if it is the will of their population, directly subordinate to RSFSR organs of state power and administration.

—To constantly take into account relations not only between national-state formations within the country, but also between nations, ethnic groups, and national groups in republics and regions.

—To ensure all the rights and conditions for maintaining national traditions and developing the culture and language of citizens living outside their national-territorial formations or not having such formations or the USSR and for their representation in organs of power. To continue the practice of creating national-cultural centers and associations [*obshchestvo*], making use of experience already accumulated. These could work under the leadership, and with the help of, corresponding soviets and could have their own representatives on the soviet.

—With the consent of republic Supreme Soviets and krai and oblast soviets, national regions [*raiony*] and rural and settlement soviets may be created in areas densely populated by nationalities without their own national-territorial formations. And it enshrine in law the right of national groups and communities to self-government.

—To stipulate the possibility of the formation of all-union state social organs to represent citizens belonging to peoples which do not have their own territorial autonomy.

—To provide in law the right of national-cultural centers and social organizations the right to maintain cultural ties, both through the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries and directly, with similar cultural-enlightenment organizations in other states in which they have ties of common ethnic origin or cultural heritage in order to develop contacts between ethnic minorities and citizens of such states.

The CPSU Central Committee shares the public concern about the position of the numerically small peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East. The industrial development of the territories they inhabit is being conducted without proper consideration for their way of life or for the social and ecological consequences. These peoples need special state protection and help.

It is necessary to grant soviets in these territories the exclusive right to develop them economically—that is to say, forests, land, internal waterways, coastal waters, forests, and the creation of nature reserves with a view to restoring and maintaining the areas where these peoples live. A congress of representatives of the indigenous peoples of the North, Siberia, and the Far East will be convened in the very near future and an association set up to represent their interests at all levels of administration.

All other numerically small peoples in our country require an equally careful attitude and equal concern.

Regarding National Culture and Language

Policy in the sphere of culture, where the combinations of the national and international aspects assume special importance, must be raised to a qualitatively new level commensurate with the present stage of the socialist society's development.

The CPSU proceeds on the basis of a recognition of the distinctive identity and unique value of national cultures. The preservation of this distinctive identity must be ensured by legal measures precluding any discrimination or lack of respect.

Resolutely condemning any forms of infringement of national cultures, the party sees its task as being to ensure the free development of the spiritual life of all the USSR's peoples. The forms of this development are determined in a sovereign fashion by each of these peoples without regulation [reglamentatsiya] or restriction. In the same democratic way, conditions should be created for the development of the internationalist processes of interaction between cultures on a countrywide scale and also participation in the cultural life of other countries and all mankind.

Questions of national-linguistic policy in the USSR assume special importance. Its basic principles were and remain the free development and equal rights of all languages and the voluntary choice of the language of instruction. At the same time the need arises for the legal regulations of these questions.

The expediency of deeming the language of the nation, after which is named the union or autonomous republic, to be the state language is a matter for the republics themselves. The status of state language must not lead to linguistic discrimination. It means the expansion of its social and cultural functions, the resolution of the material and technical, cadre, pedagogical, and other questions required for this, and encouragement and assistance in the study of the local language by representatives of other nationalities.

It is a historical reality that our country's language of interethnic communication is the Russian language. Therefore, in all respects it is advisable to create favorable conditions for the development of national-Russian and Russian-national linguistic communication. The reinforcement in law of Russian as the general state language to be used on the territory of the whole country and functioning on an equal footing with the state languages of the republics would meet the interests of all the Soviet peoples.

It is important to ensure also state and social concern for preserving and developing the languages of numerically small peoples, as the most fragile asset.

All these questions could be reflected in a special USSR Law on the free development and equitable use of the languages of the USSR's peoples, which could be adopted after nationwide discussion.

The Nationalities Question and Citizens' Rights

A most important task in strengthening the cooperation among Soviet peoples and at the same time building a socialist rule-of-law state is the full and consistent implementation of the constitutional principle of citizens' equality, regardless of racial and national affiliation.

Any attempts to infringe upon people on grounds of nationality must be regarded as unacceptable and contrary to the principles of Soviet statehood.

Soviet citizens must feel at home anywhere in the country—that can be said to be the supreme, ultimate goal of all work to harmonize interethnic relations.

In this connection it is advisable, in particular:

—To adopt a law on guarantees of the rights of USSR citizens living outside their state-territorial formations or not having such on the territory of the Soviet Union. To have similar laws in the union and autonomous republics.

—To ensure the right to receive native-language instruction in school and to use the native language in social life, of the preservation and development of national traditions, and of the protection of the living environment.

—To guarantee in law judicial and legal protection of Soviet people's national honor and dignity. Our legal arsenal must include an obligation to make restitution for moral and material damage caused by insults to national feelings and infringements of national pride and actions aimed at kindling national enmity must be prevented or stopped with the full rigor of Soviet laws.

—To define by law the conditions under which nationalist or chauvinist organizations and groups must be dissolved and banned.

—Conflicts which for various reasons have occurred on interethnic grounds require a particularly attentive approach and tact and must be resolved on a constitutional-legal democratic basis, openly [glasnost], and representatives of all the interested parties must take part.

The solution of the problems connected with the conflict surrounding Nagorno-Karabakh must be approached from these standpoints.

—All measures must be taken to resolve the problems of the Crimean Tatars, Soviet Germans, Greeks, Kurds, Koreans, Meskhetian Turks, and others.

The interests of all the peoples involved in the situation in question, the existing realities, and the likely consequences for people's lives must be taken into account in resolving such questions.

Events in a number of republics and regions show the full importance of the question of guarantees for people's safety, the observance of their civil rights, the maintenance of calm, and confidence in their future.

—There is a need for a legislative act ensuring the total political rehabilitation of the peoples who were subjected to repressions and mass deportations and creating guarantees that nothing similar can ever recur. This must be done in the name of historical truth, in the name of our moral ideals.

The Central Committee Politburo Commission on Political Rehabilitation must make a special examination of

[illegible]

The constitutional guarantees and rights of Soviet citizens must be observed in implementing each point. It is necessary to seek to ensure the representation in organs of power, management, the judiciary and the prosecutor's office and in the leadership of economic and sociocultural institutions of all the peoples living in the country and in each republic, while taking account of people's business and professional qualities, [illegible] and to expand their participation in all-union state and social organs.

In view of the fact that the question that is being raised in the multiple-candidate system of nominating and electing deputies that led to the loss or reduction of the representation of particular peoples in republican organs of power, the creation of a special mechanism capable of compensating for these phenomena should be considered. The creation of a second chamber in the Supreme Soviets of union and autonomous republics of Soviets of representatives of national groups living in republics attached to the Supreme Soviets of those republics and empowered with the right to initiate legislation could be such a mechanism.

The 19th CPSU Conference resolution "On Interethnic Relations" recommended considering the question of creating a state organ on nationalities' affairs and national relations along with the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities and its commissions. In this connection it is expedient to have a special subdivision within the USSR Government.

Regarding the Ideological and Theoretical Aspect of the Nationalities Question

Noting the fundamental importance of developing the Soviet federation, enhancing the role of national autonomy, and resolving the vital economic and social problems of all the peoples inhabiting the country, the party deems it necessary to sharply invigorate and step up ideological and theoretical work in this sphere.

The peoples' friendship won in the October Revolution and tested in the Patriotic War was for Soviet people of many generations their vital concern, and this was one of the most important guarantees of the normal development of interethnic relations in the country. The seeds of interethnic strife scattered in the social environment of late cannot be allowed to sprout in the future or to be able to spoil the lives of our children and grandchildren. The international and patriotic education of the young generation must be the paramount task of the party, soviets, trade unions, labor collectives, the Komsomol, the family, and the school.

Radical changes are needed in the very attitude and content of work to shape an internationalist consciousness. Highfalutin phrases about unity that are out of touch with reality and lofty conversations and proclamations that are not backed up by cogent arguments have been ineffective. Here, too, there is a need for new political thinking that will not accept dogmatism. It is necessary to proceed on the basis that internationalism is not a denial of the right to the national or the conscientious account of the peculiarities of the people's national interests and at the same time defense of common human values and consideration of the progressive trends gathering strength throughout the world. It is important for internationalism to be perceived as a conscious personal requirement and something inspired externally, from outside.

The anti-humanist meaning of interethnicism (chauvinism) is overwhelming, with nationalism and chauvinism. As recent events have shown, within which there are nationalist, chauvinist and extremist elements which are speculating on economic and social difficulties, deliberately exacerbating the situation in a number of regions of the country and kindling interethnic conflicts, which has led to loss of life and the appearance of refugees, has entailed great material losses and may have unpredictable consequences. Irresponsible politicians as well as national-careerists exploiting the slogan and slogans of renewal and pursuing narrow group interests, as those of the whole nation, have caused this [illegible].

Such actions must be firmly curtailed. Freedom cannot be replaced with anarchy and violence. The laws of the nation uniting our people would mean disaster. Those who have embarked on the criminal path or those who promote it should not be tolerated.

A clear dividing line must be drawn between the growth of national self-awareness and nationalism. To condemning any manifestations of nationalism, it is important to be sensitive and responsive to all legitimate requirements and aspirations which are national in character.

The role and place of religion in interethnic relations must be reconsidered, as must its influence on national self-consciousness. It is intolerable to set people against one another and especially to incite national hatred on religious grounds.

Above all, we need the unadorned and full truth about the real processes in the development of interethnic relations in the USSR, about the reasons which led to the emergence of acute collisions in interethnic affairs. No "blank spots" must remain. All this is needed in the name of strengthening trust and mutual understanding. Where there are debates and doubts, no effort must be spared to establish the truth on a collective basis.

The mass media have a special role in carrying out the party's nationalities policy. Hence stems the increasing responsibility of communists working in radio and television and in the central and local press. Only a profound

respect for the national feelings of each people and at the same time an extremely principled approach in assessing events taking place can help to calm minds and overcome the contradictions which have arisen.

The CPSU's nationalities policy needs new approaches to organizing comprehensive theoretical and ethnosociological studies of the objective processes of the development of nations and national relations in the country, the liberation of theory and practice from dogmatism and stereotypes, the use of world experience in the solution of the nationalities question, and the elaboration of scientifically validated recommendations. For this, it is necessary to expand the scientific research and information base and examine the question of forming a scientific research institute of interethnic relations and other essential measures of this kind.

Both the world's and our own experience indicate that the nationalities question always has a specific historical content. In order to resolve it there are not and cannot be formulas which suit all instances in life, which are the same at all stages of socialist development and for all regions in the country. Nationalities policy is a continuous creative process and means the ability to respond in a timely fashion to the problems which arise in the sphere of interethnic relations, to find efficient mechanisms to solve conflicts, and to take account of the real dialectics of life's processes.

These are the CPSU's proposals on questions of improving interethnic relations in the USSR and renewing nationalities policy. The examination of them by the Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the adoption on this political basis of the necessary legislative acts will impart a new quality to the Soviet Federal State and will provide the conditions for the free development of all the USSR's peoples and strengthen friendship, mutual assistance, and cooperation among them.

Nationalities Draft Plan Criticized

18280018J Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 19 Sep 89 p 2

[Article by Yu. Semukov, chairman of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic: "We Are for Real Autonomy"]

[Text] **Sokiryakar—I perceive the draft platform on the nationality question to be an extremely significant document, both politically and practically. Because the nationality question today is of critical importance in the life of the country.**

In approving the platform as a whole, however, I do not want to refrain from making serious comments. They concern first and foremost the provisions regarding national autonomies. Let us take, for example the Komi ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]. It is an organic part of Russia, but has this really saved us from the dictates of union departments? We can no longer reconcile ourselves to branch monopolies that take natural resources and leave very little in exchange.

And what is happening to the forests? Why cut them down, if there is no capability to remove them? When you ask this question of the workers of Minlesprom [Ministry of the Timber Industry], they answer: "The plan!" The attack on forests adjacent to the tundra has already started. If this will also continue in the future, an ecological disaster is inevitable.

The departments try to persuade us that we should not complain, because, they say, the republics annually receive a billion and a half in capital investments.

But these really solid sums go towards the processing and removal of our natural resources! The Council of Ministers of the Republic has access to RS0 million a year—crumbs that have to be divided among 10 cities and 16 rayons. In recent decades, more than 300 of our villages where the indigenous population lived have been eliminated. The people moved to forest settlements, which have their own problems—there are not enough schools, hospitals, and clubs. In level of social services and utilities, the Komi ASSR is by no means counted as prosperous among all of the autonomies and oblasts of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic].

"Something, of course, will change, if, as the CPSU platform envisions, the RSFSR will have its own state and economic organs. But this will hardly be enough. We believe that the only realistic alternative to branch arbitrary rule would be to grant autonomous republics the same economic rights granted to union republics. Without this, discussions about cost accounting and about the fact that people should be complete masters in their own land are pointless."

It seems to me that the CPSU platform also does not adequately develop the mechanism for realizing the political rights of the autonomous republics. This is a question first of all about their representation in higher organs of authority, both of the Union and the RSFSR. Here is a graphic example. Seventeen persons were elected people's deputies from our republic. But only two of them are representatives of the indigenous nationality. Some of our comrades think that even this is all right, and that it could have been worse. But, in fact, is this really normal? Even if you take the indigenous inhabitants in relation to the entire population, ratios are still not maintained.

There is an objection. That is why we have democracy. I agree. But it did not prevent giving 750 deputy seats to the higher organ of the country to public organizations, even to such as the Red Cross. Then why, let us say, was not a third of the seats allotted to national autonomies? This would have been fair and politically far-sighted. Because the national question today is the most important one in the matter of strengthening our Union. And so it has to be strengthened with practicable actions.

This problem becomes even more urgent within the framework of Russia. Unfortunately, this aspect is also not cleared up in the draft Law on the Election of People's Deputies of the RSFSR. A two-chamber parliament is proposed for the republic, but is this really enough? Because the situation is not excluded where in one or the other chamber, our republic, or, let us say, Mordovia, will be represented by people of other nationalities—Russians, Ukrainians, Belorussians. Because they are an overwhelming majority in our country.

I do not consider references here to the democracy of elections to be appropriate. To the contrary, as it seems to me, democracy in our society should consist of the fact that each national group is qualified to have a number of its own representatives in the central and republic organs of authority which will be proportional to the numerical size of its population. This means that a well-thought-out mechanism is needed which would guarantee a proportional and truly democratic representation. The CPSU platform, unfortunately, does not propose this.

I do not consider the complaints about the infringement of the rights of the majority to be justifiable. Because in the elections to RSFSR people's deputies, there should be no nationality distinctions in seven of the territorial okrugs. Everyone votes and can be elected. But as for the national-territorial okrugs, here consideration has to be given to the interests of the indigenous population of the autonomies. The only question is how to to do this practically, and what should be the method for advancing it? It is necessary to maintain this right for collectives, but on the condition of nominating an unlimited number of candidates of indigenous nationality. The final decision about their nomination on the scale of republics, could be left up to sessions of the Supreme Soviet.

This is one variant for ensuring representation of the autonomies in the higher organs of the RSFSR. Other variants are also possible. But the best has to be selected. I am convinced that, without full representation of the autonomies in the higher echelons of authority, it will be difficult to talk about harmonizing ethnic relations in the country as a whole.

Pugo on Party Control Committee, Gusev Reprimand

LD2209234489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 22 September in the "Vremya" newscast carries a 5-minute report by Correspondent Yevgeniy Sanitsyn on the 22 September meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee.

Sanitsyn notes that one of the matters discussed was "the irresponsible attitude of particular communist leaders of standing bodies of the USSR Council of Ministers and a number of ministries and departments that provide the population with nonfood prime necessity goods." Sanitsyn notes the goods shortages mentioned at the meeting include "soap, washing detergent, toothpaste, razor blades, school notebooks, pencils, nylons, irons, teapots, stoves, wallpaper, gasoline, and building materials." Sanitsyn is shown in an empty conference room.

Following Sanitsyn's initial remarks, the video shows an interview with B.K. Pugo, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee chairman by Sanitsyn.

Sanitsyn asks Pugo, "In respect of all the shortages there are people who have not foreseen something, who have not taken something into account, and who have not planned for something. In general, those responsible have been irresponsible. Well, Boris Karlovich, they may be such, but even if they are punished, will there still once again be no soap?" Pugo replies, "I think this question is justified, because repeatedly now we have heard statements by a whole number of very senior functionaries to the effect that all these shortages of soap and other detergents will be eliminated. Comrade Gusev, USSR Council of Ministers deputy chairman, who heads the relevant bureau of the Council of Ministers, today gave quite unambiguous assurances that this problem will be resolved before the end of the year.

"Today's Party Control Committee meeting was an unusual one. Today leaders at a very high level were brought strictly to account before the party. Incidentally, it might be worthwhile saying that this has been done because we have been receiving very many letters both from communists and from nonparty members, in which people speak precisely of the fact that there is a need for people to be brought to account. I have here one of the very many letters received. It is from Sakhalin. It says that it is necessary to expose the whole chain of specific culprits to blame for this matter of shame for our country. It even makes a suggestion. It says that a Party Control Committee commission should work in parallel with the commissions of state bodies, since almost all leaders are communists. Yes, this is indeed so.

"The party control committee today was very exacting. Comrade Gusev, of whom I was speaking, was reprimanded. (Moscow TASS in English at 2149 GMT on 22 September carries a report citing Pugo's "Vremya" interview which says "Strict party penalties were imposed on high-ranking officials, including Vladimir Gusev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.") In addition reprimands were given to Comrade Lakhtin, who is deputy chairman of the bureau for Social Issues, and we have very severely punished Comrade Bespalov, the former minister for the Chemical Industry. Perhaps, I might like to speak in more detail about this matter." Pugo continues, saying, "He is now no longer a minister. He heads the Committee for Inventions. However, I feel it is quite justifiable to raise the issue that responsibility should be borne by all those people who in the past committed either errors or miscalculations and who brought about this complex situation. We levelled very serious complaints against him and gave him a severe reprimand on behalf of the party Central Committee. We

believe that for every matter there should be a person who is answerable for that specific matter."

Sonitsyn then notes he believes the authority of the party will markedly increase if people know that communists are being punished more severely than nonparty members and, the higher their post, the more severely they are punished. To this Pugo replies, "I think such a formulation is fully justified."

Yeltsin 'Indignant' Over PRAVDA Article

LD2309141789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2150 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Interview with Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, USSR people's deputy, by correspondent Tamiya Chapicheva on 21 September, place not specified, from the "Novosti" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Chapicheva] A few days ago PRAVDA printed an article from the Italian newspaper LA REPUBBLICA in which your visit to the United States is depicted in grotesque form. Today the editorial offices of PRAVDA is offering its apologies to you. How do you regard these publications?

[Yeltsin] The fact that PRAVDA let itself slip so low as to reprint from other newspapers a diary of social events, moreover one based on lies and slander through and through, is simply insulting to the readers of PRAVDA. I am indignant, clear to the bottom of my heart, even at the fact that this is an insult to a people's deputy. One feels ashamed for the organ of the Central Committee, for those in the Central Committee who should be dealing with the press in a proper way—not lecturing, ordering, or censoring.

[Chapicheva] Can the situation in the country change in connection with the Central Committee plenum that has just ended?

[Yeltsin] On the one hand, the plenum went off in an active manner. On the other hand, it took place in a fairly traditional spirit. In the third place, it was held later than it should have been. But all the same, the main thing, the main thing at the expense of which it should happen is the real transition of the republics to economic independency, to financial autonomy, to real sovereignty, so that the republics really do have national dignity, so that autonomous republics have almost the same rights as union republics. [as heard] Then in my view will gradually defuse the entire situation, which at the moment is becoming increasingly heated and has not yet reached its peak at the present time.

Afanasyev Acted 'On Own'

LD2309172689 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 1630 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] According to the latest information from the Italian paper LA REPUBBLICA, it was through political ill-will that Victor Afanasyev, the editor-in-chief of PRAVDA, took over from the paper [LA REPUBBLICA] and printed the article showing Boris Yeltsin in a bad light. The writer of the now-notorious article told Budapest radio that as far as he knows, Afanasyev wanted to drive a new wedge between Boris Yeltsin and Mikhail Gorbachev. He was acting on his own, and now he will probably be dismissed.

LA REPUBBLICA Correspondent Apologizes

LD2309201789 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Text] The Moscow correspondent for the Italian newspaper LA REPUBBLICA, Ezio Mauro, has apologized on behalf of his editors to Soviet MP [member of parliament] Boris Yeltsin following its publication of unverified material.

Boris Yeltsin, in an interview with Radio Moscow, said Mr (Maura), who had been in touch with the paper's editor in chief, said the paper carried PRAVDA's apology to Yeltsin in two of its issues as well as Mr (Maura's) protests over PRAVDA's publication of his article without his permission.

LA REPUBBLICA's article portrayed Boris Yeltsin as the man with a weakness for alcohol who had been on a shopping spree in the United States.

Boris Yeltsin held out the possibility of bringing a legal claim against LA REPUBBLICA.

Yeltsin Comments on Visit to United States

LD2409172189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2140 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Interview with Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Construction, by Tamiya Chapicheva on 21 September, place not specified—recorded, from the "Echo" program]

[Text] [Video shows Yeltsin seated behind a desk covered with papers.]

[Chapicheva] Do you think your stay in the United States produced any specific results?

[Yeltsin] It was my first time in the United States, and I was there not to seek out evils but to seek out positive and interesting things that we could adopt. And there really is a great deal that is positive. They are businesslike people, the Americans. I had four or five meetings and speeches (in each place), including meetings with President Bush, the vice president, the secretary of state, a large group of senators, a group of congressmen, governors, and city mayors in 11 states. Since it was a private visit, we did not, of course, conclude any contracts, but we discussed 10 points. We spoke about, finally scrapping the restrictions on our country and giving us most-favored-nation status in trade and economic cooperation. On the whole, they consider this to be realistic and possible. There were numerous other

issues we discussed, such as architecture. The buildings there are really like great blocks of stone, like gravestones in a cemetery—wonderful architecture that pleases the eye. Whatever floor you live on there is no noise.

Then there was the second issue—for them to build in our country 1 million apartments, good comfortable ones. And there will be people here who will happily buy them, because they will be built to a higher level of comfort, to their standards rather than ours, as it were.

One cannot adopt everything, but one can adopt some of it. So, people nowadays just do not accept it when we dogmatically repeat "No, we are building communism." This may keep people living in poverty, it may somewhere... [vague gesture of the hand] But in fact we have to create a socialist base that incorporates the experience we have and the experience in the socialist countries, but that also, casting aside our pride, adopts their [Western] experience—experience that can be placed on a socialist foundation. And it can be.

Yeltsin Buys Disposable Syringes for Hospitals

LD2409203289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Sep 89

[from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Presenter] Chasing up a newspaper controversy. A report from our correspondent.

[A. Gurmov, identified by screen caption] We are conducting this report from Sheremetyevo Airport. Last week Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin returned from the United States, and today he came to get his luggage. He was paid $100,000 for his lectures in the United States.

Boris Nikolayevich, tell me, what did you bring for your children and grandchildren?

[Yeltsin] Out of the per diem that I was entitled to, I asked my comrades and they bought a calculator and a toy pistol for my grandchildren, which fitted into my hand luggage.

[Gurmov] In these boxes is something in short supply to end all short supplies, disposable syringes. In all 1 million of them have been bought. And today they will be dispatched to nine Moscow town children's hospitals, and to the No 13 children's polyclinic in Ramenki. [Video shows Pan Am plane and Yeltsin standing by crates of syringes, which he helps to load into a medical car. It then cuts to the Children's Town Clinical Hospital, where an unidentified doctor is interviewed, intercut with pictures of sick children]

[Gurmov] How many injections are given to children every day?

[Doctor] Every day in each hospital children are given about 3,000 injections. Now fall is coming and there are more people sick, so there will also be more injections.

[Gurmov] And how many of them are done with disposable syringes?

[Doctor] Very few are done with disposable syringes. There is a disastrous shortage of disposable syringes. We use disposable syringes mainly for blood donors.

[Gurmov] Today there are more syringes, but not enough. We need more than 4 billion of them. Meanwhile, each of these children is faced by the real threat of being infected by an infectious disease, the most terrible of which is AIDS. [Video returns to airport]

[Gurmov] Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin is not a private person. He is a political figure, and I am sure that some people will regard his acts as self-advertisement, a desire to earn brownie points. Even if that's the case, the points will be well deserved.

Yeltsin Views Politburo Changes, Reform Pace

LD2309141589 Moscow World Service in English 1338 GMT 23 Sep 89

[Text] Soviet MP Boris Yeltsin, who also sits on the Communist Party Central committee, in an interview with Radio Moscow has said he spelled out support to the shake up within the party leadership at the Central Committee's recent plenum. More from Sergey Gorbachev.

[Sergey Gorbachev] Three of the aged Politburo members, Vladimir Shcherbitskiy, Viktor Chebrikov and Viktor Nikonov, told the plenum that they were stepping down because of age reasons. Two nonvoting Politburo members also followed suit. The event is believed to have strengthened President Gorbachev's hand with the party leadership. Boris Yeltsin, said to be the country's leading radical, supported the reshuffle and has given his assessment of Mikhail Gorbachev's activity.

Gorbachev's display of greater resolve and self-confidence at the plenum took place at a difficult time for the country's reform in the economy, finances, and ethnic relations. Boris Yeltsin said that was encouraging and voiced hope that the president would be firm in the future, passing from half-measures to strong and revolutionary action.

Boris Yeltsin also spoke about his recent tour of the United States and the issue he raised during talks with President Bush, a secretary of state, senators, and businessmen.

To speed up the pace of reform by giving it new impetus and to prevent a reversal, he said, the two countries must launch a number of joint projects. Boris Yeltsin placed the accent on joint projects instead of aid. He said bilateral trade was sluggish because of America's discriminatory measures, although both countries had a huge untapped potential. He said the United States must remove its trade barriers and give the Soviet Union most-favored nation status in trade.

Boris Yeltsin, who is in charge of the parliamentary committee for construction and architecture, said the widely publicized programme of each family being provided with separate housing by the year 2000 was unfeasible given the current demands for an estimated million flats. He said he offered the Americans to build and sell that amount of flats in the Soviet Union to mutual advantage.

On the second parliamentary session, opening on Monday, Boris Yeltsin said it would be crucial to the country's economic reform.

Apart from discussing next year's budget and development plan, a number of laws will have to be passed including legislation on the land and land use, on ownership, cooperatives, leasing, state enterprise, regional self-accounting and local government. He said since these are closely related they must be discussed as one package.

Boris Yeltsin is one of the leaders of what is now known as the interregional parliamentary group, believed to be rallying more radical legislators. He said the group is to bring alternative versions of some bills and that there would be heated debates.

USSR Supreme Soviet Session Previewed

LD1809070589 Moscow TASS in English 0655 GMT 18 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, September 18, TASS—(By TASS parliamentary correspondent):

The first parliamentary recess of the new Supreme Soviet of the USSR, elected by the Congress of People's Deputies early this summer, is over. Parliamentary committees and commissions of its two chambers will resume work in Moscow today. The second session of the Supreme Soviet will start in the Kremlin a week from now, on September 25th.

As a matter of fact, the period after the first session was hardly a rest-time for the deputies. These one and a half months were crammed with meetings with electors, sharp discussions and first and foremost, preparations for the forthcoming session. The importance of the decisions which the latter is expected to pass is explained by the acuteness of problems confronting the country, by the urgency of many complicated issues.

The Soviet MPs are to discuss drafts of the state plan and budget for 1990. These documents are of an extraordinary character and designed to stop the economic downslide, to ensure initial steps aimed at making the economy sounder financially and to continue its social reorientation.

Furthermore, the deputies will discuss a package of important economic legislations, including the law on property in the USSR, on land and land usage, on leasing and lease relations, on a uniform taxation system, and also on common principles governing economic and social management in union republics.

Its agenda will also include documents ensuring the efficiency of the work of parliament members. They include draft rules governing the procedure of Congresses of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, the law on the status of people's deputies.

It ought to be noted in conclusion that the autumn session of the Soviet parliament is to be a sort of preparatory stage for the second Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR, which is to consider also several constitutional questions. The necessary supplements and amendments to it will be discussed by the Supreme Soviet and submitted for approval by the Congress.

Such, in general outline, is the programme of the second session of the Soviet Parliament, supreme legislative body of the country. Its efficient fulfillment will be ensured largely by the unique experience, accumulated by deputies during the first session.

Nishanov Describes 2-Month Session

LD2709163589 Moscow TASS in English 1633 GMT 22 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, September 22, TASS—(By TASS parliamentary correspondent):

The second session of the Soviet parliament, the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, will start work on September 25 with the opening address of President Mikhail Gorbachev, a news conference was told here today.

The forthcoming two-month legislature session, Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities chamber told journalists, will be "very significant and intense".

The agenda calls for the promulgation of a package of laws and consideration of other documents concerning such pivotal issues as deepening political and economic reform and harmonizing inter-ethnic relations, Nishanov said.

Neither will the job be easy as the draft plan and budget for 1990, which the Soviet Government submitted to parliamentarians for consideration, differ in substance from the analogous documents of previous years. Geared to an emergency, they aim at overcoming adverse trends, expediting the process of economic normalization and reducing social tension.

The session will have to complete consideration of a draft law on amendments and changes in the Soviet Constitution in time for the second Congress of People's Deputies that will assemble in December to endorse the changes, Nishanov said.

In the economic field, such central decrees are to be promulgated as the law on land, property, a single taxation system, lease and lease relations.

The much debated draft laws on granting republics greater economic independence and settling collective labour disputes will also come under consideration.

The session's added significance derives from the fact that it will start working out regulatory enactments on Soviet Federation in a decisive drive for radical changes in this field too. The first batch the present session will ponder includes edicts on the free development and equal functioning of the languages Soviet nations, the free ethnic development of Soviet citizens residing outside the boundaries of the state national formations or having none on the country's territories.

The procedure will also be new—the main work will be done in parliamentary committees and commissions that will meet on three days every week. Joint and separate sessions of the chambers will be held on Mondays and Tuesdays, Nishanov said.

In answer to a question about the situation around Nagorno-Karabakh, Nishanov recalled that the recent plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee called on the parties to the dispute to display good will and ease tension in the region.

At the same time Nishanov did not exclude the possibility of taking stricter measures, locally and centrally, if tension continues to build up. The nature of such measures will be determined depending on circumstances.

Moscow TV To Cover Event

PM2209155089 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Sep 89 Morning Edition p 7

[S. Dyogantsev report under the rubric "Central Television. Live Broadcasts" "Supreme Soviet on Radio and Television"]

[Excerpts] The Second Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet begins its work in the Kremlin 25 September. The deputies are due to examine many important draft laws which will directly affect the life of each and every one of us.

Everyone certainly wants to know how the session's work will be covered by television. IZVESTIYA's correspondent asked Ostankino for details.

The first and main innovation is this. The Supreme Soviet itself will decide what will be shown and how it will be shown. Central Television has reserved the Second All-Union Program for broadcasts from the Kremlin starting at 1900 hours Moscow time. This was decided on the basis of the experience gained from the coverage of sittings of the Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet's first session.

I was told at Central Television. The deputies will decide the procedural rules for the session's work on the day of its opening, 25 September. Apart from hearings in the chambers and joint sittings of the Supreme Soviet, its committees and permanent commissions will also be at work. It is possible that their activity will take place in closed session. In addition to live and recorded coverage of the sittings, there will be reports, commentaries, and interviews circuitously throughout the day—in the "120 Minutes" morning program, the "Novosti" bulletins, the youth programs, and—of course—the main news program "Vremya." A specially set up Central Television group of parliamentary correspondents has been accredited to the session. It is made up of experienced journalists.

Another planned measure—a large television screen for direct dialogue with voters from any corner of the country—has been installed in the lobby of the USSR Supreme Soviet's session hall.

Street Fight Reported in Semipalatinsk, Two Dead

LD2309134689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Sep 89

[Text] An urgent summary which arrived at TASS on 23 September from the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs press center has turned out to be alarming. It is reported that on 21 September at about midnight in the town of Semipalatinsk in the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic a group fight occurred. About 30 to 40 youths participated in the fight. The round-ups given are evidence that the majority of participants were inebriated, probably explaining the brutality of the fight. An interfaces issue was being resolved with the aid of sticks, stones, and metal rods. Everything took place literally in a minute. When the crowd scattered, Imashev, a 10th grade schoolboy, lay motionless on the ground.

Seven people have been taken to the hospital with injuries but the doctors could not save two of them: Chantsev, born 1972, and Iun, born 1973. Over 20 participants were apprehended. The procuracy is investigating. In town there is a strengthened guard of public order.

Kazakh Supreme Soviet Adopts Language Law

LD2309124489 Moscow TASS in English 1159 GMT 22 Sep 89

[Text] Alma-Ata September 22 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Raisa Ioffe

An extraordinary session of the Kazakh Supreme Soviet today adopted a package of documents on political reform in the Asian republic, including a law on changes and amendments to the constitution of Kazakhstan and laws on the election of people's deputies. The draft laws were considered by specialists and the public.

The Supreme Soviet will remain the only body of state authority in Kazakhstan, but the number of deputies will be reduced by 150. The 360 deputies to be elected for five years will work full-time and participate in law-making.

The number of deputies in all Soviets will be reduced by 30 or 40 percent to make them more mobile and improve their quality. To achieve this task, the terms of office in high and local elective bodies have been equalled for the first time since 1936.

The new laws provide for a choice of several candidates on one mandate. One fourth of deputies, that is 90 people, will be elected from public organizations in order to fully satisfy the demands of various strata of the population and national and professional groups and raise the role of public organizations in Kazakh political life.

At the session, deputies noted with satisfaction that there is no basis of limits on the participation of ethnic minorities in elections in the new laws.

In contrast to constitutions of some other Soviet republics, particularly Baltic ones, laws and resolutions adopted by the Kazakh Supreme Soviet do not run counter to Soviet laws, thus providing the unity of legality on the territories of the republic and the Soviet Union.

Serious Situation' Described in Nagorno-Karabakh

LD2409134489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 24 Sep 89

[Text] A TASS correspondent reports from Stepanakert: An extremely serious situation has arisen in the agriculture of Nagorno-Karabakh. The drought, of which there has never been the like before in these krays, has destroyed the grain crops and burned down the grasses on the pasture land.

However, the autonomous oblast's severed rail and road communications, with other regions of the country are turning into even more serious losses for the economy. In farms, the harvest of grapes has been halted due to lack of fuel, and the state order for them has been unfulfilled by 60 percent. If the blockage continues for another 10 days, the rich harvest will perish, says Petrosyan, chairman of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonommous Oblast [NKAO] industrial committee.

The situation in public animal breeding is even worse. We have managed to receive just one-tenth of the half-yearly fund of concentrated fodder. The cattle is standing unfed for the second week. The unplanned slaughter of animals has begun at pig-farm complexes. However, it is not possible to reprocess the meat on the spot, or to take it away. Our motor vehicles, even when accompanied by military ones, are not allowed outside the boundaries of the oblast. There is nothing to fuel the equipment for a long journey.

Over the past week, we have not given the state a single tonne of meat. Now, the question of transporting this most important type of agricultural produce is being resolved by Army helicopters. The blockade of the NKAO is inflicting losses upon the economy of Azerbaijan, too.

TASS has received an anxious telegram from the leader of the Kirovabad meat factory on the non-delivery of meat from the oblast, especially pork. Meanwhile, in Kirovabad a few days ago a crowd many-thousand strong stopped and returned to Stepanakert an Army column of petrol-fillers [benzozapravshchik] heading to the military stores for fuel.

The entry of motor transport to the oblast has practically been cut off. Passenger and freight trains have not reached Stepanakert for 3 weeks now. In these conditions, military transport aviation has been forced to provide the necessities of life to the NKAO population. Since the beginning of September it has delivered over 250 tonnes of flour, over 50 tonnes of foodstuffs and 30 tonnes of industrial goods, medicines, and other important cargoes.

It is impermissible that old people, women, and children suffer from the shortage of foodstuffs and goods of prime necessity, and that the harvest grown perishes in the field. The committee of special administration and the commandant's office of the special rayon are taking measures to raise the blockade of the oblast.

Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Resumes Session

LD2309204589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 23 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet session resumed work today in Baku.

[Correspondent Georgy Zubkov, identified by caption] The session's work was specially suspended for the duration of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on interethnic relations, and the deputies arrived at the session today enriched by its program. This had an influence on the course of the session, on the adoption of laws and decisions. Among the most important documents submitted for the approval of the supreme organ of state power in the republic is a constitutional law on the sovereignty of the Azerbaijan SSR. It is aimed at strengthening the republic's sovereignty and extending its authority. At the same time it is being particularly stressed that this does not mean a weakening of the sovereignty of the USSR, which the new law notes. Azerbaijan joined voluntarily on an equal basis with the other republics.

Life itself and the dramatic events in interethnic relations have given rise to a great flow of refugees. Around 200,000 people have moved to the republic. This has created serious difficulties in Azerbaijan, where there is already a shortage of 500,000 jobs. A special Supreme Soviet commission, which was formed at the session

and the state committee on the republic, which was already set up, will be involved with job placement, provision of housing—which is also in short supply—and with other problems of the refugees, difficult fate. The session condemned the illegal action of the so-called congress of plenipotentiary representatives of the population of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, which in August proclaimed Nagorno-Karabakh to be an independent union territory. [passage omitted]

Declares 'Sovereignty'

LD2409014389 Hamburg DPA in German 2044 GMT 24 Sep 89

[Excerpts] Moscow (DPA)—The Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet has declared the Caucasian republic "sovereign within the USSR." A spokesman for the Azerbaijani Popular Front, Aziz Vyanoviev, said on a phone call from Baku: "In accordance with the declaration of sovereignty, all of Moscow's laws have to be approved by Baku in order to be valid in Azerbaijan."

The parliaments of several constituent republics spoke on the day before the autumn session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which begins on Monday [25 September].

Vyanoviev told DPA in Moscow: "The first law from Moscow we reject will concern Karabakh." The parliament in Baku has called for the region, which is inhabited by a majority of Armenians, to be put fully under Azerbaijani rule and for the special administration set up by Moscow to be dissolved. The Popular Front member suggested a possible solution might be to drive the Armenian population out of the area and to settle Azerbaijani refugees from Armenia there.

According to him, 250,000 refugees are living in Baku "without work or home." That is the source of ethnic unrest. It is like a powder keg and they could start to murder Armenians any day. Karabakh stays part of Azerbaijan or there will be civil war there," the spokesman for the Popular Front stressed.

Armenian Supreme Soviet Session Resumes

LD2309211589 Moscow TASS in English 2007 GMT 23 Sep 89

[Text] Yerevan September 23 TASS—The extraordinary session of Armenia's Supreme Soviet, interrupted a week ago, resumed today. The deputies discussed an account of the Republican Council of Ministers on its activities and the programme to come out of the crisis, the course of the implementation of the decisions on the refugee problem.

The disastrous earthquake, the known events in the region, which resulted in blocking up Armenia's transport arteries, created an emergency situation. Vladimir Markaryants, the prime minister of the republic, said in his report.

Economic pressure cannot help solve an inter-ethnic conflict. Joint efforts are therefore needed to solve it.

Speakers at the session pointed to the unconstructive attitude to the fate of over 200,000 immigrants. Many of them are skilled workers and specialists and want to work in the earthquake zone and enterprises. But the local authorities are slow with their residence registration and providing them with housing facilities and employment, though working hands are needed everywhere.

Frunze: The extraordinary session of Kirghizia's Supreme Soviet, which ended today, devoted its second day to the deepening of the political reform locally, solution of the language problem. The deputies passed Kirghizia's Law on Changes and Supplements to the Constitution (the Basic Law) of Kirghizia, laws on elections of people's deputies of the republic and elections of deputies of local soviets of people's deputies.

The draft law of Kirghizia on the state language of the republic was heatedly discussed. Speakers noted that the Kirghiz language should be given the status of the state language of the republic and the Russian—the status of a language for inter-ethnic communication. Concern was voiced for the lot of languages of other peoples residing on the republican territory. The law on the state language of Kirghizia was passed.

Dushanbe: The extraordinary session of the Supreme Soviet of Tajikistan, which opened today, is marked by a heated discussion. Deputies discussed draft laws on supplements and changes to the constitution of Tajikistan on elections of deputies of local soviets. By a majority of votes the deputies supported the provisions of the draft laws which guarantee equal electoral rights to the citizens of the republic, irrespective of race and nationality, language and religion, the time of residence.

The Supreme Soviet of the republic passed a law to supplement the criminal code of Tajikistan with an article envisaging responsibility for violation of the equality of the languages on the republican territory.

Vilnius: The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet's session today passed a statement on the political situation in the republic, the decision on putting into life economic independence, the decision on the work of the republican commission to study the German-Soviet treaties of 1939 and their consequences. The deputies heard information on the discussion of the draft law of Lithuania on citizenship. The session will be resumed on September 28.

Baku: The extraordinary session of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet, which ended in Baku today, declared for consolidation of the political, economic and cultural independence of the republic within the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics. The parliamentarians expressed support for the CPSU Central Committee's platform. The session passed the law on Azerbaijan "on sovereignty of Azerbaijan." The decision was taken to

connection with the so-called "Congress of Plenipotentiary Representatives of the Nagorno-Karabakh Population" held in Stepanakert on August 16, 1989 which declared the refusal to recognize Nagorno-Karabakh's status as an autonomous region within Azerbaijan and proclaimed it "an independent union territory" with the republican legislation no longer valid on it. The deputies denounced the action, qualifying it as unlawful.

Organization of Blockade Should Be 'Condemned'

LD 2409172889 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 15:00 GMT 23 Sep 89

[From the Republican Press Review]

[Excerpt] KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN newspaper has published the decision of the Armenian Supreme Soviet concerning the urgent measures to eliminate the tension in the region and end the blockade of Armenia and the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. In particular, the decision states that the organization of the blockade of the Armenian republic and the NKAO by the Azerbaijan republic should be strongly condemned. It is not an economically but a politically motivated act to undermine by the use of force a just solution of the NKAO problem by democratic means. Considering that the Azerbaijan railways are part of the Soviet transportation system and as such should be immune from local interference, the Armenian Supreme Soviet has asked the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet to place them under military control. It also called for an extraordinary conference of USSR people's deputies that would take special measures to lift the blockade. In light of the [words indistinct] in freight transportation as a result of the blockade, and the losses incurred in the agricultural and manufacturing sectors, it asked the USSR Council of Ministers to make use of civil and military aircraft on a massive scale for the transportation of freight. It asked for extraordinary measures for the transportation of 31,000 prefabricated houses and other goods to the disaster zone. It also decided to ask the USSR Council of Ministers to cover the losses incurred in relation to freight cars and goods on Azerbaijani territory from the budget of the Azerbaijan republic.

Blockade Causes Tension

PM 2109151089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Sep 89 Second Edition p 5

[Report by own correspondent A. Sarkisyan: "Republic in State of Alarm: Emergency Situation"]

[Text] Yerevan—"Blockade" is the most widely used word in Armenia today. It is difficult to credit, but one of the union republics in our socialist state is now in the grips of economic blockade. Roads are closed. The railroad is paralyzed. There has never been anything like it in our state's history.

A few days ago PRAVDA, IZVESTIYA, SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA, SOVETSKAYA KULTURA, STROITELNAYA GAZETA, TRUD, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, Central Television and All-Union Radio correspondents had hoped that upon publication of a collective letter to the editorial offices of central newspapers the people who had shut down Armenia's vital arteries would think better of it. One can become accustomed to a shortage of food and industrial goods. But when hundreds of thousands of people who have experienced a dreadful tragedy are forced to spend the winter literally out in the open, the situation causes anger and indignation.

"Unfortunately, little has changed in the 3 days since the article in PRAVDA," I. Sarkisyan, first deputy chairman of the Armenian Council of Ministers, told me in conversation. "With great effort we were able to convince the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic leadership to allow traffic into Armenia. But participants in the talks had no time to disperse before the road was again closed the next day. As a result only four freight trains got through. The republic's working people find themselves on involuntary strike. Many enterprises are at the point of coming to a standstill. There are no raw materials. The damage caused the republic and the country by the continuing economic blockade already comes to hundreds of millions of rubles. A session of the republic Supreme Soviet, which has interrupted its work, adopted an appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet demanding that urgent measures be taken to lift the blockade."

The situation is very grave in every sense. On 21 September not a single republic or central newspaper was published in the republic. All newsprint has been exhausted. The inhabitants of Armenia have not read the proceedings of the CPSU Central Committee Plenum on the nationalities question. In view of the situation, the PRAVDA Publishing House printed an edition for Armenia in Moscow and delivered a copy to subscribers by scheduled flight at 1400 today.

Representatives of construction organizations who have come here from every corner of the country to assist in the disaster zone are constantly turning to the PRAVDA correspondents center.

It is reported from Spitak that Norwegian specialists who were preparing a 200-bed hospital for commissioning on a turnkey basis were on the point of leaving without having completed their work. They have not received any of their own freight for over a month, and all work schedules have been disrupted.

The situation in the republic is becoming chronic. Penicillin, other great drugs, and matches have disappeared from the stores. Calm among the people is being maintained for the time being thanks to the emergency measures adopted by the republic's government. However, tension continues to mount.

Armenian Officials Interviewed

LD2809210889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 21 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast report over video by correspondent Vladimir Nazaryan]

[Text] [Nazaryan] The Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet extraordinary session once again continued its work today after a 2-day break. Azerbaijan's continuing blockade of the republic, the people's concern, and indignation at this unprecedented act of force, and the failure to adopt effective and urgent measures to remove the blockade of course also influenced the work of the session's latest sitting. Alarm at the situation which has taken shape was to be heard more than once in an account given by the Armenian SSR Council of Ministers, and in the program to emerge from the crisis presented by Vladimir Markaryants, head of the republic's government.

[Begin Markaryants recording] From 4 to 21 September a total of more than 26,000 loaded railcars have failed to arrive. As a result, a difficult situation has come about regarding providing foodstuffs to the population, as well as gasoline for motor vehicles and diesel, cement, combined fodder for poultry and livestock, and materials and equipment for industry and construction to the national economy and the population so far. The adopted measures are not producing results. [end recording]

[Nazaryan] On 17 September—the 1st day of its work—the current extraordinary session adopted a decision by the republic's Supreme Soviet on the immediate removal of the blockade of Armenia and the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. Five days have passed but the situation has not changed, alas.

Was there any change on 21 and 22, over those 2 days?

[Begin recording] [A.A. Kandityan, head of the Yerevan department of the Transcaucasian Railway] On 21 September we received absolutely nothing at all. It was as if they were demonstrating (?their emotions) at the committees of the plenum. On the 22nd we received only 4 trains with 160 railcars.

[Nazaryan] That's a drop in the ocean, isn't it?

[Kandityan] It's a drop in the ocean when 26,000 railcars have failed to arrive. The whole republic is suffering now, and the comrades are stating, hypocritically, on television that they have opened the gates and have lifted the blockade of Armenia. [end recording]

[Nazaryan] The situation is acquiring an increasingly dramatic nature with every day that passes. Macaroni, Vermicelli, rice, and matches have disappeared from the shops, and this is at a time when there are in Armenia more than 500,000 homeless people in the aftermath of the earthquake, and more than 200,000 refugees. The arrangements for the settlers from Azerbaijan and the list of additional measures to improve this work was also heard today. The session is continuing its work.

Arutyunyan Discusses Region's Situation

LD2809150889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 24 Sep 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast interview with Suren Gurgenovich Arutyunyan, USSR people's deputy and 1st secretary of Communist Party of Armenia Central Committee, by correspondent Nazaryan]

[Text] [Nazaryan] Late yesterday evening, the extraordinary session of the Supreme Soviet of the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic interrupted its work again in connection with the upcoming session in Moscow. Before he departed today, we spoke to Suren Gurgenovich Arutyunyan, USSR people's deputy, first secretary of the Communist Party of Armenia Central Committee.

[Begin recording] [Nazaryan] Suren Gurgenovich, at the session yesterday the main debates should, it seemed, have developed around the report from the republic's Council of Ministers.

[Arutyunyan] It would have been strange if the republic's Supreme Soviet deputies had left aside the questions which greatly worry the working people and, I would say, the entire population of our republic.

Let us take just the question of the blockade. Today there are half a million people without homes in the disaster zone. How many orphans? How many cripples? And yet now, when we to say the building and reconstruction work is in full swing, when it is entering the decisive stage, roads are being closed, the arrival of building materials is being halted. Hundreds of building detachments which have come from all the union republics and areas of the country, have in fact stopped work.

And how awkward we feel toward foreigners. I won't give an evaluation of this fact, this phenomenon. I think viewers will do this for themselves, or rather, I think they already have, of how unacceptable these methods of pressure are on the part of one republic toward another. And I completely agree with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev when he said that the success of perestroyka depends to a large extent, and is determined by the way in which we tackle how we deal with questions of relations between nationalities in our country.

A solution to specific questions and problems was not to be expected from the plenum. That was not the task facing the plenum. The Central Committee plenum was facing a very great, serious, I would say large scale task. To determine the principles, the basic directions of the nationalities policy of the CPSU in today's conditions. As for specific problems and specific issues, they are the prerogative of the higher bodies of state power. In particular it is, or at least was, intended to hear the

conclusions of the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission on the problem of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast at the session.

But what do I want to say in conclusion? That, of course, things are not easy for us in the republic today. Not at all easy in the republic. We see our task as being to see that the people look to tomorrow with optimism, to instil in them feelings of some kind of certainty about their fate, about the future.

I will say frankly that we are very worried about the morale and psychological state of the population of the republic. I wouldn't like—we wouldn't like—a wave of pessimism to overcome the working people, the population, first and foremost the young people of our republic. [end recording]

Paper Shortage in Armenia Hits Printing Plants

SK2609153989 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 21 Sep 89

[Excerpts] Yerevan, 21 Sep (ARMENPRES)—In about 2 days subscribers will not be able to receive republican newspapers and the locally-published PRAVDA with their peculiar scent of printing ink. Why? This is how S. Torosyants, director of publications for the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, replied.

[Torosyan] We have no more newsprint in stock and we now are using the last newsprint received from state stocks. We use [number indistinct] tons of newsprint daily. Since 24 August we have not received a single kilogram. The reason is the railway blockade by Azerbaijan. [passage omitted]

By now we would have stopped publication had the leadership of the republic not brought from the state reserve. Normally we would have a month's stock. We have appealed in vain to the editors of the central newspapers, to the Ministry of Communications, to the highest bureaucratic echelons and even to the CPSU Central Committee. Azerbaijan does not want to lift the blockade and no intervention shakes their resistance. [passage omitted]

We also feel the shortage of other printing materials, not to mention fuel. We transport with great difficulty the newsprint we now obtain. [End Torosyan speaking] [passage omitted]. This blockade is not economic, rather it is a political, national, spiritual, and ideological blockade.

Lithuania Rules Polish Rayons' Status Invalid

PM2609135089 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 25 Sep 89 p 1

[Unsigned Our Correspondent report under the general heading "What Is Going on in Lithuania"]

[Text] Vilnius, 22 Sep—For the better satisfaction of the cultural and social needs of the nationalities living in the republic, a Committee of Nationalities has been created under the republic's Central Committee by resolution of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Another question has been examined. As is well known, on 6 September and 13 September last, two rayon soviets adopted decisions which declared the Shalchininkai and Vilnyusskiy administrative rayons to be Polish national-territorial rayons. The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has noted in a resolution that these decisions violate the republic's state territorial integrity and are contrary to the Lithuanian SSR Constitution and the Law on the Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies. They were not prompted by objective historical, political, or economic reasons. Such unauthorized decisions, the resolution notes, sow discord among people, and a considerable proportion of the inhabitants of those rayons do not accept them. In that context the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium has deemed these resolutions invalid.

Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Discusses 1939 Pact

LD2309083189 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 23 Sep 89

[Excerpts] Today we shall dwell exclusively on the work of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, that is, parliament, which started its work yesterday. [passage omitted]

Meanwhile, the second day of work at the session managed to progress by two more items of the agenda, both most important to Lithuania. The first issue was passing a decision on the recent findings of a Lithuanian parliamentary commission set up to investigate the German-Soviet treaties of 1939 and their consequences to Lithuania, widely referred to as the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact. We shall remind our listeners that these findings are believed to have caused the wrath of Moscow, which materialized in late August in the form of the statement by the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee on the situation in the Soviet Baltic republics.

At the session today the main findings were stated again by the head of the commission, Academician Juras Pozela. They key points of the findings are these:

The German-Soviet treaties were a violation of international law and must be thus declared null and void since the day of their signing.

The treaties led to an aggression and forcible incorporation of Lithuania and other Baltic states into the Soviet Union.

The undemocratically elected Lithuanian parliament in 1940 had no legal authority to make the declaration on joining the USSR, and only a referendum could decide that.

Several MP's spoke on the issue at the session today, focusing on various aspects of the 1939 German-Soviet agreements and their present consequences for Lithuania.

With only two MP's abstained and no one against, the parliament passed a decision by which it approved of the work done by the commission and agreed that the commission should continue its work. It was also decided to appeal to the Supreme Soviet of the USSR so that a similar commission set up by the Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow should speed up its work. The Lithuanian parliament also expressed its concern that the preliminary findings made by the Moscow commission have not been made public to this day.

The second issue discussed today was that of Lithuanian citizenship law. Many speakers referred to it as an essential stage in restoring the statehood of Lithuania. [passage omitted] Though the majority of MP's supported the idea of Lithuanian citizenship and only questioned separate articles or their wording, two non-Lithuanian MP's were strongly critical about the intended law as a gross violation of the rights of Non-Lithuanians. [passage omitted]

As expected, the deputies did not cope with all the work and the session is to be renewed next Thursday. [28 September]. [passage omitted] Late this evening the Lithuanian parliament passed a decision that it was too early to adopt a citizenship law. It was still to be submitted for further public discussion and perfection. As Minister of Justice Pranas Kulis put it, a law on citizenship must be in harmony with international law and democratic tradition. It must exclude any infringement of the rights of those people who already are residents of Lithuania.

Incorporation Declared 'Illegal'

LD270910 Helsinki International Service in Finnish 1500 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet has declared the country's incorporation into the Soviet Union in the summer of 1940 as illegal. The decision made by the Lithuanian People's Deputies in Vilnius is the strongest stand adopted so far in questioning the Soviet Union's right to govern the Baltic republics. Here is Martti Honka.

[Honka] The Parliament of the Lithuanian Soviet republic, the Supreme Soviet, declared invalid the vote taken in 1940 whereby independent Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Union. In addition, the Supreme Soviet, meeting in Vilnius, condemned the Red Army's occupation of Lithuania in the same year. With the resolution the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet put itself on a direct collision course with General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev. Gorbachev stated this week at the Central Committee Plenum in Moscow that there are no reasons to doubt the justifications whereby the Baltic nations decided to join the Soviet Union. Thus the joining was voluntary. Such [word indistinct] is impossible to imagine.

Yesterday the Lithuanian Communist Party threw down its own challenge to the Kremlin by publishing its new draft program. According to the program the Lithuanian Communist Party intends to make itself independent [within] the Soviet Communist Party. Gorbachev had something to say about this matter, too, at the Central Committee. Gorbachev stated that the [word indistinct] of the party would mean the end of the party founded by Lenin and would cause irreparable damage to perestroyka and the cause of socialism. Soviet television at these points in the speech showed the enthusiastically applauding audience, in the middle of which a number Lithuanian party leader Algirdas Brazauskas was also making notes.

In other ways, too, the Central Committee showed no understanding for the Baltic viewpoint. One speaker after another condemned the separatists—clearly meaning the Baltic nations' inhabitants. From the Kremlin viewpoint, the stand taken in recent days by Lithuania is also worrying in that Latvia and Estonia might be keen to follow its example. The commission appointed by the USSR Supreme Soviet is aimed at calming the Baltic situation. The commission's job is to give a political assessment of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of half a century ago. However, the commission does not seem to be reaching agreement on the content of its memoranda. One leader of the opposition group in the Congress of People's Deputies—the historian Yuriy Afanasyev—in Moscow today accused Politburo member Aleksandr Yakovlev and Valentin Falin, the head of the Central Committee's International Department, of hindering the work of the commission. Afanasyev said that the commission should recognize the fact that the Baltic countries were occupied and forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union.

For the Kremlin this recognition is still too bitter to swallow, which is why tension in the Baltic countries goes on rising and rising.

Lithuanian Party Program Foundations Published

LD270910 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] The draft foundations of the program of the Communist Party of Lithuania are being published today in the republic. The current socioeconomic and political situation, the strengthening of democratization, the national rebirth of Lithuania, and the striving for a sovereign state in which all citizens are endowed with equal rights, the document says, poses new tasks for the Communist Party of Lithuania. In order to become a political force in the creation of an independent Lithuanian state which is based on the rule of law, the Communist Party of Lithuania itself, in the course of perestroyka, is becoming independent.

The draft stresses that a common ideological platform links the Communist Party of Lithuania with the CPSU and the republican Communist Parties. It points out that the Communist Party of Lithuania categorically dissociates itself both from the legacy of Stalinism and from the administrative command plan of socialism and also from a dogmatic interpretation of Marxist-Leninism.

The aim of the party has been formulated so well a way as to create in Lithuania a democratic socialist society, a sovereign state which has cultural and economic links with the Soviet Union, with its republics, and with other countries.

The orientation toward the following hierarchy of universal human values is stressed: the person, the family, the people, the state. The party is striving to ensure that the political direction known to everyone as all power to the soviets acquires real democratic content. The Communist Party of Lithuania believes agreement about interethnic relations is an important condition and a prerequisite for the resolution of political, socioeconomic, and cultural problems confronting the Stalinist concept of merging nations. The Communist Party of Lithuania also denounces stuff from rightists and views that call for absolute national exclusivism and lead to national egocentrism and chauvinism.

Bases for 'Federalization'

LD2709173889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1500 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 27 Sep (TASS)—A TASS correspondent writes. Today the draft Bases of the Lithuanian Communist Party program was published in Lithuanian, Russian, and Polish in Vilnius newspapers. The appearance of this document on the Soviet Baltic republic is being connected with the preparation for the regular congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party which is planned for the end of the year.

In accordance with the statutes of the CPSU which are valid on the whole territory of the Soviet Union, any USSR citizen who recognizes the party's program and statutes can be a member. For this reason the fact that the Communist Party of a union republic has decided to develop its own program is outstanding, all the more so because the idea of federalization of the party lies at the basis of the document. "In order to become a political force in the creation of an independent, law-based Lithuanian state, the Lithuanian Communist Party itself is becoming independent in the course of perestroyka," the draft says.

This document is published 2 days after the CPSU Central Committee plenum at which Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, condemned any attempts to federalize the party. "This would mean," he said from the plenum's tribune, "the end of our party as it was founded by Lenin and would inflict irreparable damage to perestroyka and the entire cause of socialism. Whoever follows this path will assume the most grave responsibility before the party and the people."

Party Secretary Baltrunas Assesses Plenum Results

LD2709134889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0700 GMT 27 Sep 89

[Interview with Valerijus Baltrunas, secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, by correspondent Victor Labovitov, from the "120 minutes" program; on Vilnius date not specified—recorded]

[Text] [Labovitov] I am aware that the plenum, the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, has only just concluded its work. It is still difficult to make an in-depth analysis of the decisions taken at it. For all that, what is the main thing that you would like to pick out today?

[Baltrunas] Yes, I am in agreement with that fact that one still has to make a thorough study of all the materials of the plenum. For the moment, we have only had the opportunity to acquaint ourselves with the report. Today the speeches are being published. I think the main thing that has been achieved is that the plenum was held, very necessary because many complicated problems that are difficult to resolve had built up regarding national relations, both in the country as a whole and in our republic, too. Many of our ideas, which have already been implemented in our republic, have received great support.

[Labovitov] Which specific ones, if you can tell us?

[Baltrunas] Specifically, for example, a law has been passed on Lithuanian as the state language. We have prepared a concept of economic independence. At present, groundwork for the program of the Communist Party of Lithuania is at its final stage. Many other questions in the context of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report are also reflected in them. I think the theoretical disclosure of some questions which are highly controversial today is of great significance. For example, the Leninist concept of the self-determination of a nation is very topical in our republic, too. So many problems that required their own solution, their own elucidation, were completely resolved and elucidated.

At the present time, in actual fact, a situation is taking shape in our republic whereby at first glance everything looks calm. Industry and agriculture are working confidently. Political life is also developing actively and rapidly. But one has to say that many fairly complicated problems exist which perhaps are not apparent at first glance. I could not agree, for example, to an unambiguous definition of the need to set up national autonomous raions, regions, where populations of another nationality live together. For us that is an acute issue.

[Labovitov] You have in mind the so called Polish autonomy that has already been declared in two raions of Lithuania.

[Baltrunas] But this apparently is still not the end of it. Other regions continue to have similar aspirations, too. I think that here we will have to look for some kind of

compromise solutions because, on the one hand, there is the Polish population taking the line of an alternative and, on the other hand, clearly not everything has been done by our ministries and departments. Recently we held a very crucial meeting with representatives of the Polish population, and I feel sure that we shall find some kind of political method to resolve this problem without causing real excitement, to speak, on the streets of the republic's entire population.

[Laberstev] In other words, as was stressed at the plenum, can all these complicated, difficult problems of interethnic relations be resolved only by way of dialogue, by joint compromises, meeting one another halfway?

[Baltrunas] This is quite right. We proceed in all our political work in the Communist Party of Lithuania on the basis of dialogue, on the basis of seeking compromise solutions, political solutions. I think that is how it will be in the future as well.

As far as the decisions of the plenum are concerned, it is understandable that a great deal of ignorance went into ahead to realize all these thoughts, all these ideas that were expressed in the reports and which have understandably been included in the platform.

Foreign Debt Statistics Published

LD2309183589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1740 GMT 22 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 22 Sep (TASS)—PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK [GOVERNMENT HERALD], the organ of the USSR Council of Ministers, has for the first time published in its routine edition data on the USSR's foreign indebtedness as of the start of 1989. It composed R133.1 billion, including R28.1 billion in freely convertible currency.

Indebtedness in restricted currencies (clearing) R15 billion, in transferable roubles (TASS) billion (including Bulgaria R501 million, Hungary R400 million, GDR R400 million, Poland R700 million, Romania R600 million, Czechoslovakia R1.5 billion).

Media Leaders Describe Press Role in Perestroyka

LD2309183589 Moscow TASS in English 1748 GMT 22 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow September 22 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondents Boris Zverev and Vladimir Kokin:

At the present stage of development of Soviet society the mass media is bound not only to reflect realities but also to actively influence the current changes in the country. It was noted at a meeting of heads of diplomatic representations accredited in the USSR with the leaders of the Soviet news agency TASS, the NOVOSTI press agency and the USSR State Television and Radio Committee at the USSR Foreign Ministry's press center today.

They dwelt on the structure and functions of the Soviet mass media and the new tasks facing journalists now that public openness and democratization in the USSR are broadening.

The Soviet press, TASS General Director Leonid Kravchenko said, fulfils a very important function, narrowing our shortcomings, both those from previous years and those that are only appearing today, during perestroyka.

"We are sometimes censured for 'too much criticism' but we ourselves have sought the opportunity to critically analyze the state of affairs in the country," Kravchenko continued. "One cannot but agree with those who say that Soviet mass media lacks a constructive approach, since really critical articles about causes promote perestroyka."

Gregory Morozov, deputy chairman of the USSR State Television and Radio Committee, dwelt on the Soviet people's growing interest in the mass media since the advent of perestroyka. The number of letters to Soviet television from viewers has increased by almost a third in the past three to four years, exceeding one million a year, he said. Most of the comments come after discussion programmes which raise topical and acute questions of social development. Morozov expressed the hope that television appearances of party leaders and statesmen would be aired on a regular weekly basis in the near future.

All participants in the meeting noted that for journalists in the USSR it has become more interesting and more difficult to work in the new conditions, when a huge volume of new information, ideas and novelties provide too much food for comprehension. The law on the press being drafted will not only give journalists extra rights but will neatly define their duties and responsibility to society. This does not mean, however, that a journalist is not entitled to have his own viewpoint, different from the official opinion. A pluralism of opinions should become a reality, the speakers stressed.

Soviet mass media leaders answered a number of questions from diplomats and journalists. One of them was about an article from the Italian newspaper LA REPUBBLICA recently reprinted by the newspaper PRAVDA on Boris Yeltsin's visit to the United States.

Although that item in PRAVDA bore the TASS signature, the news agency has not distributed the article officially, the TASS general director stressed. PRAVDA took the decision to reprint the article on its own. In Kravchenko's opinion, the newspaper made a blunder. "It is not the rule for our press to carry cheap articles wherever they come from—home or abroad," he stressed.

Scientific

'Cosmos-2045' Launched 22 Sep; Parameters Given

LD2209125589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1240 GMT 22 Sep 89

[Text] Moscow, 22 Sep (TASS)—Another artificial Earth satellite, Cosmos-2045 was launched in the Soviet Union today.

The satellite carries scientific apparatus for continuing space research.

The satellite has been placed in an orbit with the following parameters: Initial period of revolution, 89.6 mins, apogee, 322 km, perigee, 216 km, orbital inclination, 70 deg.

Besides scientific apparatus, the satellite carries a radio system for the precise measurement of orbital elements and a radiotelemetery system for transmitting to Earth data about the work of the instruments and scientific apparatus.

The apparatus aboard the satellite is working normally.